

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

First Lt. James Edgar Macklin, 2d, Infantry (detailed in Quartermaster Corps), with rank from October 24, 1929.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Joseph Milton Colby, Cavalry (detailed in Ordnance Department), with rank from October 1, 1934.

First Lt. William James Latimer, Jr., Field Artillery (detailed in Ordnance Department), with rank from October 1, 1934.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Col. William Fitzhugh Jones, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from November 1, 1933.

TO COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Second Lt. Earl Sipple Eckhart, Infantry, with rank from June 10, 1932.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE MAJOR

Capt. George Ralston Middleton, Field Artillery, from January 21, 1935.

TO BE CAPTAIN

First Lt. James Longstreet Whelchel, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 21, 1935.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Second Lt. David Haytor Buchanan, Infantry, from January 21, 1935.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Col. Thomas Holcomb to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of February 1935.

Lt. Col. Charles F. B. Price to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of February 1935.

Maj. Karl I. Buse to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of February 1935.

Capt. Donald J. Kendall to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of January 1935.

Capt. Lewis B. Reagan to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of February 1935.

First Lt. Lawrence R. Kline to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of January 1935.

First Lt. William W. Paca to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 26th day of January 1935.

First Lt. Shelton C. Zern to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of February 1935.

First Lt. John E. Curry to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of February 1935.

Second Lt. Louis C. Plain to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of May 1934.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 4, 1935

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Robert E. Wilson, Homerville.

ILLINOIS

James D. Larry, Sr., Melrose Park.

MASSACHUSETTS

Henry L. Pierce, Barre.

Esther K. Whitcomb, Bolton.

Celia R. St. John, Cohasset.

Merritt C. Skilton, East Northfield.

Douglas H. Knowlton, South Hamilton.

John W. Mitchell, South Lancaster.

MISSOURI

W. Rufus Jackson, St. Louis.

NEVADA

Ernest H. Bath, Carson City.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Harry Frank Smith, Center Harbor.
Charles E. Tanner, Milton.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Nicholas DeBilzan, Andover.
Fred C. Wetterberg, Arlington.
Milton W. Butts, Belle Fourche.
Ernest A. Schlup, Hudson.
Charles R. Dean, Rockham.
Mary V. Breene, Seneca.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Who is the King of Glory?

Our God and our Father, He is the King of Glory. This new weekday we pause in Thy name. We praise Thee that the Eternal One is love. It is the supreme and the undying truth of the world. Heavenly Father, much there is to bear and impossible to understand, yet no affliction, anguish, privation, or peril shall ever be able to stagger or confuse the divine care. Thou art destined to dominate the turbulent waters and hush the seas of human life into peace. In Thy holy name we pray that Thou wilt heal the sore in heart by giving them power and faith to look to others. Merciful Lord, bind up that which is broken and rekindle the sacred fires. To those who have lost courage, hope, or desire and have failed and fear to fail again, be Thou their rich and abundant portion. Graciously bless our Speaker and the Members of the Congress. May they always retain that vision, strength, and purity of soul that walks in the light. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 1, 1935, was read and approved.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

FEBRUARY 1, 1935.

Hon. JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

*Speaker House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to law, I am notifying you and also sending notice thereof to Chairman BUCHANAN of the designation of the following members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives to be members of the Board of Visitors of the Military Academy for the Seventy-fourth Congress: JOHN J. McSWAIN, Representative from South Carolina; LISTER HILL, Representative from Alabama; ANDREW J. MAY, Representative from Kentucky; R. EWING THOMASON, Representative from Texas; CHARLES I. FADDIS, Representative from Pennsylvania; CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Representative from Vermont; DEWEY SHORT, Representative from Missouri; and L. C. ARENDS, Representative from Illinois.

With very great respect, I am, yours truly,

J. J. McSWAIN, *Chairman.*

CRIMINAL ACTIVITY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following report on House Resolution 94, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 94, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the question of personal privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. As a basis for the question of personal privilege I read the following from the newspaper, the Record Ledger, Tujunga, Calif., issue of Thursday, January 24, 1935.

The heading is:

JOHN MCGROARTY reports an old-age-pension plan now before Congress.

And the subheads are:

Townsend-plan measure in committee—Administration has altogether different idea, by JOHN STEPHEN MCGROARTY, Member of Congress for Eleventh California District.

The article is dated from Washington, D. C., and, quoting the article from Congressman MCGROARTY, reads as follows:

On Wednesday, January 16, I introduced in the House of Representatives an old-age-pension bill which was cited as the "Townsend old-age revolving pension plan." It is the bill approved by Dr. Townsend himself, officially designated as H. R. 3977.

A vicious attack was made on the bill already on the floor of the House by Representative THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Abilene, Tex. He held up the measure to ridicule and declared himself unalterably opposed to it. However—

And I want the Speaker to notice this:

However, it remains to be seen whether or not the Honorable BLANTON may change his mind. One way to cause him to change his mind is for all Texans residing in California to go after him in the mail and by telegraph. The thing to do is to get the people of BLANTON'S district to organize Townsend clubs in numbers and strength on a parallel with our clubs at home.

Now, I want the Chair to notice this statement:

This man is probably in the same boat with other Members of Congress who have a burning desire always to return to Washington and continue in the pleasant, easy, and well-paid service of the Government as a Congressman.

Notice this statement particularly, if the Chair please:

BLANTON might have a change of heart and of mind if made aware that he might stand no more chance than a jack rabbit to come back to Congress against the wishes and will of his constituents. Let the order of the day in the Townsend clubs be to contact all Texans, who, in their turn, shall contact their folks in the panhandle.

The article then proceeds with a lot of other statements which I do not care to take the time of the House to read or with which I do not wish to encumber the RECORD, but these statements call on Californians to write friends in every single district in the United States and ask them, in substance, to try to force Members to come over to this plan.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the article the gentleman has read does not state a question of personal privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes, it does, Mr. Speaker. I call the Chair's attention again to this paragraph especially:

This man probably is in the same boat with other Members of Congress who have a burning desire always to return to Washington and continue in the pleasant, easy, and well-paid service of the Government as a Congressman. BLANTON might have a change of heart and of mind if made aware that he might stand no more chance than a jack rabbit to come back to Congress.

Certainly that paragraph reflects upon every Member of this House in his representative capacity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been deluged with letters, thousands of them, some from every part of California, and some from other States, which are abusive, threatening, and insulting, incited by this published article.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield to my friend from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Rule IX reads as follows:

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; second, the rights, reputation, and conduct of Members, individually, in their representative capacity only; and shall have precedence of all other questions, except motions to adjourn.

The gentleman from Texas has raised a question of privilege by reason of the publication which he has already read. The Chair finds in the publication this language:

This man is probably in the same boat with other Members of Congress who have a burning desire always to return to Washington and continue in the pleasant, easy, and well-paid service of the Government as a Congressman. BLANTON might have a change of heart and of mind if made aware that he might stand no more chance than a jack rabbit to come back to Congress against the wishes and the will of his constituents.

The Chair may state that this presents a rather close question, but in view of the statements which the Chair has read it seems to the Chair there is an implication that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] might resort to any sort of method necessary to bring about his return to Congress. The Chair thinks that the statement affects the gentleman's reputation and conduct in his representative capacity, and for that reason the Chair overrules the point of order and recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] for 1 hour.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from California, Mr. JOHN STEVEN MCGROARTY, and myself are good friends. We have been friends ever since we have known each other. I have now a kindly feeling for him. I would not do one thing on earth to hurt him; and as long as I stay in this House, I will never do anything to hurt one of my colleagues back in his home district.

I have been receiving for the last week a deluge of letters every day and in every mail from California, and within the last few days I have been receiving them in stacks from my own district in Texas. These letters were incited by his article he published in California. Some of these letters impugn my motive for standing up against the Townsend old-age-pension plan, asserting that I have not sympathy for the aged or the unemployed and the aged who cannot get jobs, asserting that I do not know the problems which daily confront them, that I am cold-hearted and cold-blooded, and some of them go so far as to state emphatically that I have sold out to the moneyed interests of the land simply because I refuse to vote for the \$24,000,000,000 Townsend bill that would wreck this Government.

I received a letter yesterday morning from a friend in Texas stating that the gentleman from California [Mr. MCGROARTY] was causing letters to be sent in my district seeking to organize it against me and put me out of Congress. I went to him immediately and told him about it. I did not know then about the article he had published in California. He very kindly wrote me this letter.

May I ask the Clerk to read this?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the letter.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 3, 1935.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I learn with deep regret indeed that rumors have reached you to the effect that I am engaged in efforts to undermine you in your district, with the avowed purpose of defeating you in the next election.

The rumors are utterly without foundation. I have never made such efforts and would not be guilty of them. In the first place, it would be an impertinence on my part and certainly it would not be to my credit.

From my observation of you in the House of Representatives since I became a Member of that historic body, I am free to say that your district is most effectively represented by you. All of your colleagues and mine whom I have met regard you as one of the most useful men in the Congress of the United States, which is my own opinion of you.

I do not hesitate to say that, in my judgment, your defeat in your district at the next election, or any succeeding election, would be a serious loss, not only to your constituents but to the Nation itself.

Please accept the expression of my high esteem and good will.
Faithfully yours,

JOHN STEVEN MCGROARTY.

Mr. BLANTON. That letter, Mr. Speaker, shows that we are good friends, even if we do differ on the Townsend plan, and I appreciate it highly, for it should convince these strangers who are writing me these insulting letters that I do not deserve annihilation at their hands.

This article, which my friend Mr. MCGROARTY has published in California, causes people seeing it everywhere, who do not know me, to say these unkind things about me, and to write me insulting, threatening letters. All of you who know me and who have served with me during the last 18 years will know that such threats of defeat will not cause me to vote against judgment.

Here is what my friend Mr. MCGROARTY states further in this letter he published out in California:

Everybody familiar with the provisions of the Townsend plan will see at once that the President has another idea altogether concerning old-age pensions * * * will not propose a pension exceeding \$30 per month. Let it be known to all friends of the Townsend plan that they cannot expect action until at least 30 days have elapsed. Those 30 days will be employed by us in arguments before the Ways and Means Committee, to which the bill has been referred. If the committee, after 30 days, fails to send the bill to the House, then we shall have to secure the signatures of 218 Members to discharge the committee as far as this bill is concerned, and thus bring it to the House for debate and action. The new rule requires 218 signatures.

If a bill is presented to carry the President's old-age-pension plan into effect, we shall move to amend the bill by substituting the Townsend plan for the President's plan.

My office is visited every day by news writers and photographers wanting copy and pictures.

Let me again tell the folks at home that the battle will be hard fought, both for and against. The best way to help us who are carrying on the fight here in Congress is for the people of our various congressional districts to contact by mail or telegraph Members of Congress in other districts of the country in all of the States. There are in southern California people from every State in the Union who must have kinfolk, friends, and acquaintances in the States from—

It is this article that our good friend Mr. McGROARTY published in California that is causing all of us to get letters, propaganda letters, from all of the United States. Until I received this newspaper I wondered what was causing them to be written.

I do not have any unkind feelings toward our friend for causing this trouble, for I feel sure that he had no intention of doing any of us any injury. It was zealotry for his cause and for his bill, and I gladly forgive him the trouble he has caused me.

I picked out of my mail this morning, from the number of letters received from California, a cross section of the letters, one each from different towns in California, just to give you an idea of what they contain. As I stated, this is just a cross section which will typify the big stack I have received this morning.

Here is one from William Justema, 140 North Central Avenue, Glendale, Calif. From it I quote:

Unless you wake up you might as well start to write your political obituary.

Here is one from Laura L. Anderson, 309 North Euclid Avenue, Pasadena, Calif. She says: "Any man against the Townsend plan is no better than a bandit." And she says:

We do not halt the President's plan and we do not plan to accept it. We have higher ideals for the American people than the President's plan. Adopt the Townsend old-age plan immediately.

Mr. BELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BELL. Did the gentleman say "bandit" or "banker"?

Mr. BLANTON. B-a-n-d-i-t.

Mr. HOUSTON. What is the difference?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I know what some people think. Some bankers are crooks and have robbed people. But some are honest and good citizens. Some bankers have taken care of poor people in their sections all of their lives, and some are poor now themselves, having lost everything they previously had. All are not bandits. Some are public benefactors, and I can prove this by my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. RICH. I think, possibly, the reason they are objecting to the President's plan is the fact that from the census, as I figured it last week, it will only require \$2,400,000,000 to pay the old-age pensions, but if we accept the Townsend plan, as I believe the gentleman estimated a week ago, \$24,000,000,000 will be required.

Mr. BLANTON. Twenty-four billion dollars; yes. I did not yield on that. I yielded to let the gentleman say whether or not all bankers are bandits—are they?

Mr. RICH. Some of the finest people in the world have been in banks that have closed—

Mr. BLANTON. That answers it.

Mr. RICH. And are doing everything anyone could do to help this country become prosperous.

Mr. BLANTON. Then there are some bankers who are not bandits?

I would prefer not to be diverted while I quote from a few of these various letters received this morning.

Here is a letter from Los Angeles from Lillian L. Glancy, 2036 Browning Boulevard, Los Angeles, and I will read a sentence from her letter:

I would advise you for future election coming on that you get in behind this plan.

All of them contain a threat, thinking that if I get scared about my job I will change my mind. When I am busy here attending to the business of the people I never think about elections. The elections will take care of themselves. If you will do your duty here and attend to the business of your constituents, you need not ever be afraid of elections back home. The people will take care of you.

Here is one from A. E. Eames, 115 El Oviado Street, Arcadia, Calif.:

For your own good, get in touch with Dr. Townsend.

[Laughter.]

The people are determined that this bill shall become a law and they will see to it that Representatives are sent to Congress who will carry it out.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield for just one question.

Mr. BLANTON. Always, to the Governor.

Mr. PIERCE. Does the gentleman think he has a monopoly on getting these letters? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. No; certainly not. All of us are getting them. I am letting you know what started it.

Mr. PIERCE. I received hundreds this morning.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; it is this article that was published in California by our good friend "John."

You know, I think a lot of JOHN McGROARTY. He is a splendid, good fellow. I know he stands high in California. He has had many honors conferred upon him. He has an honorary degree of Doctor of Literature, and Doctor of Laws, and Pope Pius XI conferred upon him the Knight of St. Gregory, and King Alfonso XIII of Spain conferred upon him the Knight Commander of Isabella the Catholic. He has had a wonderful theater built out there to do him honor.

Mr. COLDEN. He is poet laureate of the State of California.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; he is the poet laureate of the State of California, and a splendid, good fellow, but, John, you ought not to write a letter like this back to California.

The people sent these men here believing they would represent them according to their best judgment. A man here in Congress, when these questions come up, cannot write back home and find out the wish and will of all of his constituents. This would be impossible. He cannot be led away by propaganda. He has got to do his best under his own judgment and that is what the people sent him here for. They have confidence in him and they believe they can rely on his judgment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. COX. I am sure the gentleman entertains a deep feeling of sympathy for these good people, and if the gentleman agrees with me—

Mr. BLANTON. Why, I have the deepest sympathy for all of them. I am in favor of the old-age pension along the lines suggested by the President. I will gladly vote for it whenever it comes up, but I am not going to vote for something that will add \$24,000,000,000 to the annual expenses of this Government, when our annual total revenues are only \$3,700,000,000.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman agrees with me in the view that the Government would not last 24 hours with this measure enacted into law, I trust he will either state something in the RECORD to sustain that position or else will do so in an extension of his remarks.

Mr. BLANTON. I will do that in a moment, but first I want to give you a slant on these letters I received this

morning. I am just reading one from each of the different towns in California.

Here is one from Mary L. Hughes, 912 Curtis Street, Berkeley, and one from Rosa B. Sturtevant, 1021 Sixtieth Street, Oakland, Calif.

They say:

The Senators and Representatives who fight it will never go to Washington again.

We who vote against the Townsend plan will never come back.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Townsend plan you say will cost twenty-four billions a year, which nobody is going to pay.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; they say that. The gentleman knows that whenever the Government spends \$24,000,000,000 it comes from the pockets of the people. Sooner or later it comes out of the pockets of the people by taxation.

The total revenue last year from income taxes, inheritance taxes, excise taxes, nuisance taxes, taxes on tobacco and cigars and cigarettes, all liquor taxes, gasoline, increase of postage, 2-cent tax on bank checks, and all other taxes, all amounts to only \$3,700,000,000.

Suppose we were to pass the Townsend plan and add \$24,000,000,000, do you know what would happen? You would have to raise in all \$28,000,000,000 to pay all Government expenditures, and you only get \$3,700,000,000 to pay it with. You would not be able to pay these people 10 cents on your obligations.

We would be like some States and cities, not able to pay. We would be like Chicago, that let its teachers, who teach their children, go for 3 years without a dollar's pay. There would not be any money to pay these aged people, and no money to pay anybody else.

You would have Government warrants discounted in a way that would make them almost worthless.

Back in my State I know a time when the legislature spent a great deal of money, was reckless about it, and the State did not have income enough to pay its warrants; teachers and officials, who had worked hard, could not get the money for their warrants; judges on the bench, who worked hard, could not get their pay and had to discount their State warrants.

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Not just now. I have letters mentioning the gentleman's name [laughter], and when I read them I will yield.

Here is another letter, from Mrs. F. B. Kellogg, 109 North Street, Alhambra, Calif. She says that "Texas people better wake up." She says that "a man who votes against the Townsend plan is not much of a man." [Laughter.] Any one of you gentlemen who votes against the Townsend plan, who votes against paying \$24,000,000,000 for old-age pensions "is not much of a man", she says, no matter whether you are strongly in favor of old-age pensions or not.

No matter how deeply concerned you are in your hearts about the aged men and women of your district, no matter how much it affects you, no matter how sympathetic you are with them, you are not "much of a man" if you do not vote for this Townsend plan.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to just as soon as I mention the gentleman. Here is another letter from J. T. Gotcher, 701½ Marine Street, Ocean Park, Calif., mailed at Santa Monica, and he says:

I know you have been a good fighter in the past. The time has come when the people want to be heard.

Here is another one from Mrs. L. M. Scherb, 415 North Plum Ave., Ontario, Calif. She says:

We all can and will vote, and you will find out we are wide awake.

There is another threat, that if I do not change my mind I shall have to stop associating with you friends of mine here in the House. Here is another one from Mrs. Laura Waggaman, 1314½ Third Avenue, Los Angeles.

Change your mind before it is too late.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I am going to mention the gentleman in just a minute. Here is one from an old Texan living out in California, Rev. W. Z. A. Wright, division manager of the old-age pension plan, living at 1214 G Street, Modesto, Calif. He says:

There is no man so blind as he who can see and won't see. Mr. HOEPEL, of California, knows that he knows this bill.

Now I yield.

Mr. HOEPEL. The peculiar thing in reference to this Townsend pension is that the laugh is going to be on the most of us unless we really examine into the proposition and act intelligently.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman two questions.

Mr. HOEPEL. I shall be glad to answer any questions the gentleman may ask.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you believe that Townsend-plan bill has any chance on earth of passing? Please answer "yes" or "no." Do you? Do you believe it has any chance on earth of passing?

Mr. HOEPEL. If I may judge from the attitude taken by this Congress in enacting legislation for and in the interest of the bankers to the exclusion of the people, then I shall say that it cannot pass until the Congress changes its attitude.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman not think that that kind of a remark, if he leaves it in the RECORD, will cause hundreds of thousands of people in the United States who read the gentleman's remarks to think Congress has more concern about the bankers than it has about the people? And I guarantee that 95 percent of my colleagues in this House have no interest whatever in bankers. They are for all of the people.

Mr. HOEPEL. Our legislation does not show that.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the gentleman's opinion. They are for the people back home.

Mr. HOEPEL. Our legislation does not prove that.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman preaches that gospel. Another question I want to ask the gentleman: Down deep in your heart, do you believe that this Townsend pension has any chance whatever to pass and be paid by the Government, 100 cents on the dollar, to the extent of \$200 every month to every person over 60 years of age?

Mr. HOEPEL. Does the gentleman refer to this Congress or to a subsequent Congress?

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about this Congress this year. Do you, down in your heart, believe it is possible to pay them \$200 a month?

Mr. HOEPEL. Yes; I covered this, I believe, quite completely in my speech of January 29.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you believe that this Government has any chance on earth to raise and pay them \$200 a month this year?

Mr. HOEPEL. If the Membership follows the leadership that the gentleman is apparently attempting to serve, certainly, it will not be enacted.

Mr. BLANTON. All right. That answers it. I cannot yield further.

The gentleman continually attacks the leadership of this House and the leadership in the White House. I am glad to be identified with both.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up any further time except to read a few more letters.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Continuing to read from the letter of the Reverend Mr. Wright, division manager of the old-age pension plan, he says:

Mr. HOEPEL, of California, knows that he knows this bill is a good bill. I am a Texan, too, and was one of the earliest settlers in the Abilene country. In fact, I lived in Taylor County 2 years before it was organized as a county, and was one of the first settlers in Abilene when it was a town of tents. My father kept the first hotel in Abilene. It was in a large tent. I went through the schools there in the early days of Abilene, happened to be living there when the first spade of dirt was turned to commence the building of Simmons College, which is now a university. You

have made some foolish statements concerning the Townsend plan. Public opinion and sentiment have changed toward our political leaders in Washington so much in the last 30 days that it is out of the question to even think of any who vote against the Townsend bill being reelected to any office in Washington or any office in our Government. A word to the wise is sufficient.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Just a moment and then I shall yield. My friend from California [Mr. HOEPEL] speaks of the leadership of this Congress in a criticizing way. My friend from California [Mr. McGROARTY] spoke of being against the President's plan. I want to tell you about our leadership in this Congress. The President in the White House, Franklin D. Roosevelt, is my leader. I am following him 100 percent. He is my leader and I am proud to follow him. I am proud he is my leader.

The Speaker of this House, JOE BYRNS, of Tennessee, is my leader. I am following him. I have confidence in his judgment. I believe in him. I am not ashamed to follow JOE BYRNS, of Tennessee. I am following my leader, ED TAYLOR, of Colorado, with whom I am now serving my nineteenth year in this House. I am proud of him. The leadership of this House is worth following. It is a leadership that is not running this Government in behalf of the predatory wealth of the country. It is a leadership that is running the country in behalf of all the people, the poor people and the rich alike.

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. HOEPEL. I do not know whether the gentleman is consistent in his remarks. I understand the gentleman from Texas is opposed to the issuance of tax-exempt securities, yet he is going to follow the President in regard to the further issuance of tax-exempt securities.

Mr. BLANTON. I am against tax-exempt securities. I will prove that I am consistent on that. I introduced a resolution to require the Secretary of the Treasury to give us the names and the amounts of every tax-exempt bondholder in the United States who holds over \$50,000, and the amount of his holdings. The committee unanimously asserts that just now my resolution should not pass.

Am I fighting my committee? No. I am accepting their judgment, that right now they want to pursue that question in another way, as the passage of my resolution just now might interfere with the plans of the administration. I have enough confidence in the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee and in the Republican members of that committee, that when they act unanimously on a proposition of that kind and show me good reason for holding that matter back, I will go along with the committee. I do not put my judgment up against all of theirs, as the gentleman from California does; and try to tear them all to pieces.

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. HOEPEL. Regardless of whether the gentleman is for the Townsend plan or not, I should like to have it known that, so far as I am concerned, I want to see the distinguished gentleman from Texas continue his membership in this House, as I consider him a very valuable and outstanding leader, but only this morning I received a letter from a constituent in the gentleman's district, which says:

HOEPEL, tell us when we should put the steam on BLANTON.

[Laughter.]

I will state, further, that I am for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], and I want him to continue as a Member of this House, but, recognizing his ability and his understanding and his deep interest and sympathy with the distressed people of the Nation, I do hope that he will at least examine into this measure a little more definitely, and come out on the floor and fight for it instead of opposing it.

Mr. BLANTON. I cannot yield further, because I do not want to take so much time. When the gentleman from California [Mr. HOEPEL] and our good friend from California, JOHN MCGROARTY, who represents the district adjoining Mr. HOEPEL, come back 2 years from now, they will find me here helping them. This "steam" process does not work.

This "steam" process never has changed a vote in this House. After all, we Members have got to stand up here and do our duty as we see it. JOHN HOEPEL would not have any confidence in me, neither would JOHN MCGROARTY, if I let a little steam pressure change my vote. The people back home would not have any confidence in me.

Let me tell you something, my colleagues from California, if you keep on persisting in promising these people something they cannot get, and something they could not get if you passed the bill, when you go back to them this next summer they will say, "Why did you not pass my bill?" You will say, "Oh, we could not do it; it was not feasible." They will blame you for leading them to believe you could pass it. I do not mislead them. I want their confidence. I want them to believe in me. That is why when I know a bill cannot pass, when I know it is economically unsound, I am the first man to get on this floor and tell them so and take the consequences. If it puts me out of Congress, let it put me out. I will take my medicine.

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I cannot yield further. I am going to read a couple of letters more and then conclude. This is one from C. C. Caves, 222 South Main Street, Pomona, Calif., and from it I quote:

Soon the people of your district will become enlightened. Save this country from communism.

They seem to be preaching the doctrine that unless you pass this bill this country will be turned over to communism. Not so. We will save them from communism.

Here is another letter from Harriet M. Dillingham, 407 South Bartlett Street, and it reads:

We voters demand your whole-hearted—yes, your body-and-soul—support for the Townsend plan.

Demand it! They want our body-and-soul support for this Hoeppel-McGroarty-Townsend plan. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. Here is one from Bell, Calif., from H. E. Thomas and Anna C. Philleo, president and secretary of Townsend Club No. 2 of Bell:

This economic system gives a few men complete charge of all jobs of the country, with full power and authority to say who shall work and who shall not, and power and authority to determine who are the ones to beg and borrow and steal and starve, or be supported by makeshift provisions like the P. W. A. and the F. E. R. A., and so forth. We believe it is time to require our Government shall cease temporizing with our distressed and spending millions and millions for something that gives no relief.

Here is one from San Diego, Calif. This is from Joseph Schaffer, of 3629 Cottonwood Street, San Diego, Calif. He says:

It is you smart boys up there who say it can't be done.

[Laughter.]

He has a sticker on this letter—one of the kind of stickers they paste on automobiles, walls, and so forth—which reads:

Politicians get money from the rich and votes from the poor.

Is that the doctrine that is preached out there—that politicians get money from the rich and votes from the poor? Do the politicians do that way out in California? [Laughter.]

Here is one from Burbank, Calif., from Mr. J. G. Estes. He is a committeeman, and lives at 918 North Verdugo Street. His letter contains this statement:

The fight is on! Throw your power to assist us.

It is a demand from him that we better throw our power behind it instead of against it. I am not going to take further time to read more of these letters, but here is one from Modesto and one from Pasadena, and another from Whittier, Calif. This presents merely a cross-section of the stacks I have received from California this morning. This is the steam that you talked about. Well, it has been put on. Do you see any process of my changing?

Mr. HOEPEL. The steam has not yet been generated.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; it has. Not only has it been generated but the fire is out, and the water has gotten cold.

Mr. HOEPEL. The Townsend plan is as perpetual as Vesuvius. In my opinion, it is going to overwhelm this Congress unless we enact it.

Mr. BLANTON. You could just as easily bridge the Pacific Ocean as pay \$200 per month to all people over 60 years of age. It is impossible.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Has the gentleman received only one letter from each writer?

Mr. BLANTON. This is merely a cross-section of the deluge I received this morning from California.

Mr. TABER. Most Members receive six or eight letters from each writer.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I have been deluged with them for the last week, because I was mentioned in the article our friend published in California.

I want to suggest to my friend Mr. HOEPEL, and to my good friend Mr. McGROARTY, if you will get some copies of a letter I wrote to some of my constituents at Mineral Wells and send them out to your constituents in California, it will be the best thing in the world for this Government and for them. It will show to the people that this plan is absolutely uneconomic and unsound and impossible.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I must conclude. It is impossible. I repeat, this Townsend dream is a gold brick that you are trying to hand the people back home, and it is fooling them and is cruel, because it will disappoint them.

I thank you for your time and consideration. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) entitled "An act making additional appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, the National Mediation Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935."

TAX-EXEMPT SECURITIES

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted an adverse report on House Resolution 73, which is as follows:

[H. Rept. No. 55, 74th Cong., 1st sess.]

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO FURNISH THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CERTAIN INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO TAX-EXEMPT SECURITIES

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following adverse report (to accompany H. Res. 73):

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 73) to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House of Representatives information with respect to certain persons and corporations who own tax-exempt securities issued by the Federal Government, having had the same under consideration, report it back to the House and recommend that the resolution do not pass.

The action of the committee is based upon the following adverse report from the Secretary of the Treasury:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: Reference is made to your letter of January 26, 1935, enclosing a copy of House Resolution 73, introduced by Representative FISH, of New York, and a copy of House Resolution 74, introduced by Representative BLANTON, of Texas, each of which directs the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House of Representatives information with respect to certain persons and corporations who own tax-exempt securities issued by the Federal Government. You state that the Committee on Ways and Means will be pleased to receive any comments or recommendations I may care to make with respect to the proposed legislation.

Section 257 of the Revenue Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 51), regulating the furnishing of information contained in income-tax returns, provides as follows:

"(b) (1) The Secretary and any officer or employee of the Treasury Department, upon request from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Finance of the Senate, or a select committee of the Senate or House specially authorized to investigate returns by a resolution of the Senate or House, or a joint committee so authorized by concurrent resolution, shall furnish such committee sitting in executive session with any data of any character contained in or shown by any return.

"(2) Any such committee shall have the right, acting directly as a committee, or by or through such examiners or agents as it may designate or appoint, to inspect any or all of the returns at such times and in such manner as it may determine.

"(3) Any relevant or useful information thus obtained may be submitted by the committee obtaining it to the Senate or the House, or to both the Senate and the House, as the case may be."

Section 22 (b) (4) of the Revenue Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 178) excludes from gross income interest on the securities of the United States or of its possessions. However, every person owning any such securities is required to submit in his return a statement indicating the number and amount of the securities owned by him and the income received therefrom. From the tax returns there is compiled for statistical purposes a statement reflecting the total amount of tax-exempt securities owned and the income derived therefrom by all taxpayers with incomes of \$5,000 or more per annum and this information could very conveniently be furnished, but to provide the information sought by the resolutions mentioned above with respect to individual taxpayers would require an examination of each and every tax return filed for the period for which such report is desired.

For the taxable year 1932 the individual returns filed to August 31, 1933, totaled 3,760,402, while the returns of corporations for the same year amounted to 481,368. For the taxable year 1933 the individual returns decreased slightly to 3,660,105, and the corporation returns were 472,174. The resolutions do not indicate whether the information is desired for a particular taxable year or for a period covering a number of taxable years. In any event it is at once apparent that the compilation of the data desired would require considerable time and involve great additional expense. It would necessitate a large expansion in the clerical force and would greatly handicap the Bureau at the present time. Numerous returns are located in the offices of the collectors of internal revenue throughout the country; others are in the hands of revenue agents who are making audits of the books and records of the taxpayers; and a great many are in process of review in the local offices of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

For the reasons enumerated above I recommend that House Resolution 73 and House Resolution 74 be not adopted.

Very truly yours,

H. MORGENTHAU, JR.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,

Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives.

In addition to the provisions of existing law cited by the Secretary of the Treasury, the committee also directs attention to section 3167 of the revised statutes which provides as follows:

"Sec. 3167. It shall be unlawful for any collector, deputy collector, agent, clerk, or other officer or employee of the United States to divulge or to make known in any manner whatever not provided by law to any person the operations, style of work, or apparatus of any manufacturer or producer visited by him in the discharge of his official duties, or the amount or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or any particular thereof, set forth or disclosed in any income return, or to permit any income return or copy thereof or any book containing any abstract or particulars thereof to be seen or examined by any person except as provided by law; and it shall be unlawful for any person to print or publish in any manner whatever not provided by law any income return, or any part thereof or source of income, profits, losses, or expenditures appearing in any income return; and any offense against the foregoing provision shall be a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both, at the discretion of the court; and if the offender be an officer or employee of the United States he shall be dismissed from office or discharged from employment."

House Resolution 73

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following information: The names and addresses of all persons and corporations who own tax-exempt securities in the amount of \$100,000 or over issued by the Federal Government; the amount of such holdings held by each individual or corporation; kind of securities held in each case; and the interest paid on such securities per annum.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is substantially the same type of resolution that was reported adversely by the committee a few days ago and, on a record vote of the House, was laid on the table. It is my purpose to make a similar motion with reference to this resolution.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes? One of these resolutions is my own resolution.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to move to lay the resolution on the table, which cuts off debate. I have promised the leader on this side, and many Members, that we would not consume very much time on this matter, because it is identical with the matter on which the House has already acted.

Mr. FISH. It is not identical at all.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. It is practically identical. The same question is involved. I yield to the gentleman if he wishes to ask a question.

Mr. FISH. May I say to the gentleman first that it is not identical at all, because the other resolution included tax-exempt securities issued by States and municipalities, which is an entirely different thing. This one has to do with tax-exempt securities issued by the Government of the United States. I do not desire to ask the gentleman any questions, but I thought I might have 5 minutes to speak on my resolution.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I am acting under the direction of the committee. This is a unanimous report from the Ways and Means Committee, and I am bound to follow the directions of that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that the resolution be laid on the table.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask for a division.

The question was taken; and, on a division (demanded by Mr. FISH), there were—ayes 132, noes 27.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-nine gentlemen present; not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 243, nays 109, not voting, 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—243

Allen	Dies	Kenney	Ramspeck
Andrew, Mass.	Dingell	Kerr	Randolph
Arends	Disney	Kinzer	Ransley
Arnold	Ditter	Kleberg	Rayburn
Ashbrook	Dobbins	Knutson	Reed, Ill.
Ayers	Dockweiler	Kocialkowski	Reilly
Bacharach	Dorsey	Kopplemann	Rich
Bacon	Doughton	Kramer	Richardson
Barden	Doutrich	Lambeth	Robertson
Beam	Doxey	Lamneck	Robinson, Utah
Beiter	Drewry	Lea, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Bell	Driscoll	Lee, Okla.	Rogers, N. H.
Blinderup	Duffey, Ohio	Lehlbach	Rogers, Okla.
Blackney	Duncan	Lewis, Colo.	Romjue
Bland	Eagle	Lloyd	Rudd
Blanton	Eaton	Luckey	Sanders, La.
Bloom	Eckert	McAndrews	Sanders, Tex.
Boehne	Edmiston	McClellan	Sandlin
Bolton	Elcher	McCormack	Schulte
Boylan	Faddis	McGrath	Scrugham
Brennan	Farley	McGroarty	Sears
Brown, Ga.	Fernerty	McKeough	Seger
Brown, Mich.	Ferguson	McLaughlin	Shanley
Brunner	Fernandez	McLean	Short
Buchanan	Flesinger	McMillan	Sirovich
Buck	Fitzpatrick	McReynolds	Sisson
Buckbee	Flannagan	Maloney	Smith, Conn.
Bulwinkle	Ford, Calif.	Mansfield	Snell
Burch	Ford, Miss.	Martin, Mass.	South
Caldwell	Fuller	Mason	Spence
Cannon, Mo.	Gassaway	Massingale	Stack
Carden	Gifford	May	Starnes
Carmichael	Gillette	Meeks	Stewart
Cartwright	Gingery	Merritt, Conn.	Sutphin
Cary	Gregory	Merritt, N. Y.	Taber
Casey	Haines	Millard	Tarver
Cavichia	Hamlin	Mitchell, Ill.	Taylor, Colo.
Chandler	Hancock, N. Y.	Montet	Terry
Chapman	Harlan	Moran	Thom
Church	Hartley	Nelson	Thomas
Citron	Hennings	Nichols	Thompson
Claborne	Hess	Norton	Tolan
Cochran	Higgins, Conn.	O'Brien	Tonry
Coffee	Higgins, Mass.	O'Connell	Treadway
Cole, Md.	Hill, Ala.	O'Connor	Turner
Cole, N. Y.	Hill, Samuel B.	O'Leary	Turpin
Connery	Hobbs	Oliver	Umstead
Cooley	Holmes	O'Neal	Vinson, Ky.
Cooper, Tenn.	Hook	Owen	Walter
Corning	Hope	Palmisano	Warren
Cox	Huddleston	Parks	Weaver
Crosby	Igoe	Parsons	Whelchel
Cross, Tex.	Imhoff	Pearson	Whittington
Crowe	Jacobsen	Peterson, Fla.	Wigglesworth
Cullen	Jenckes, Ind.	Peterson, Ga.	Williams
Cummings	Jenkins, Ohio	Pettengill	Wilson, La.
Daly	Johnson, Tex.	Peyser	Wilson, Pa.
Darden	Johnson, W. Va.	Plumley	Wolcott
Darrow	Jones	Powers	Woodrum
Delaney	Kahn	Quinn	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Kee	Ramsay	

NAYS—109

Amlie	Fish	Lemke	Ryan
Andresen	Fletcher	Lord	Sauthoff
Bolleau	Focht	Ludlow	Schneider
Buckler, Minn.	Gasque	Lundeen	Scott
Burdick	Gearhart	McFarlane	Secrest
Burnham	Gehrmann	McGehee	Shannon
Carlson	Gilchrist	McLeod	Smith, Wash.
Carpenter	Goodwin	Maas	Stefan
Carter	Gray, Pa.	Mahon	Stubbs
Castellow	Greenwood	Mapes	Sweeney
Christianson	Greever	Marcantonio	Taylor, S. C.
Colden	Guyer	Martin, Colo.	Taylor, Tenn.
Collins	Gwynne	Maverick	Thomason
Colmer	Harter	Michener	Thurston
Costello	Hildebrandt	Miller	Tobey
Cravens	Hill, Knute	Mitchell, Tenn.	Truax
Crawford	Hoepfel	Monaghan	Utterback
Crosser, Ohio	Hoffman	Mott	Wallgren
Culkin	Houston	Murdock	Wearin
Deen	Hull	Patterson	Werner
Dietrich	Johnson, Okla.	Perkins	Withrow
Dondero	Keller	Pierce	Wolfenden
Driver	Kimball	Pittenger	Wolverton
Dunn, Miss.	Kloeb	Polk	Wood
Dunn, Pa.	Kniffin	Rankin	Woodruff
Ekwall	Kvale	Reece	
Engel	Lambertson	Richards	
Englebright	Larrabee	Robison, Ky.	

NOT VOTING—79

Adair	Ellenbogen	Lanham	Schaefer
Andrews, N. Y.	Evans	Lesinski	Schuetz
Bankhead	Frey	Lewis, Md.	Smith, Va.
Berlin	Fulmer	Lucas	Smith, W. Va.
Biermann	Gambrill	McDuffie	Snyder
Boland	Gavagan	McSwain	Somers, N. Y.
Brewster	Gildea	Marshall	Steagall
Brooks	Goldsborough	Mead	Sullivan
Buckley, N. Y.	Granfield	Montague	Summers, Tex.
Cannon, Wis.	Gray, Ind.	Moritz	Tinkham
Celler	Green	O'Day	Underwood
Clark, Idaho	Greenway	O'Malley	Vinson, Ga.
Clark, N. C.	Griswold	Patman	Wadsworth
Cooper, Ohio	Hancock, N. C.	Patton	Welch
Crowther	Hart	Pfeifer	West
Dear	Healey	Rabaut	White
DeRouen	Hollister	Reed, N. Y.	Wilcox
Dickstein	Kelly	Russell	Young
Dirksen	Kennedy, Md.	Sabath	Zioncheck
Duffy, N. Y.	Kennedy, N. Y.	Sadowski	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Marshall (for) with Mr. O'Malley (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Mead with Mr. Wadsworth.
 Mr. Lanham with Mr. Hollister.
 Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Crowther.
 Mr. Schaefer with Mr. Brewster.
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
 Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Reed of New York.
 Mr. Granfield with Mr. Welch.
 Mr. McSwain with Mr. Tinkham.
 Mr. Montague with Mr. Dirksen.
 Mr. Sabath with Mr. Andrews of New York.
 Mr. Ellenbogen with Mr. Russell.
 Mr. Dear with Mr. Pfeifer.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Lucas.
 Mr. Hart with Mr. Biermann.
 Mr. DeRouen with Mrs. O'Day.
 Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Duffy of New York.
 Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Brooks.
 Mr. Berlin with Mr. Patton.
 Mr. Sirovich with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Young.
 Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. West.
 Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Healey.
 Mr. Griswold with Mr. Snyder.
 Mr. Green with Mr. Evans.
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Buckley of New York.
 Mr. Underwood with Mr. Gavagan.
 Mr. McDuffie with Mr. Wearin.
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Kelly.
 Mrs. Greenway with Mr. Wilcox.
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. White.
 Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Utterback.
 Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Schuetz.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. COOPER of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX-EXEMPT SECURITIES

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted an adverse report on House Resolution No. 74, which is as follows:

Resolution

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following information: The names and addresses of all persons and corporations who own tax-exempt securities, issued by the United States Government, in the aggregate amount of \$50,000 or over; the amount of such holdings held by each individual or corporation; kind of securities held in each case; and the interest paid on such securities per annum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this report is identical with the last report. Could we not have the report printed in the *RECORD* without reading it at this time?

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, that is true. I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the *RECORD* in full and not read at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

[H. Rept. No. 56, 74th Cong., 1st sess.]

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO FURNISH THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CERTAIN INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO TAX-EXEMPT SECURITIES

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following adverse report (to accompany H. Res. 74):

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 74) to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House of Representatives information with respect to certain persons and corporations who own tax-exempt securities issued by the Federal Government, having had the same under consideration, report it back to the House and recommend that the resolution do not pass.

The action of the committee is based upon the following adverse report from the Secretary of the Treasury:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: Reference is made to your letter of January 26, 1935, enclosing a copy of House Resolution 73, introduced by Representative FISH, of New York, and a copy of House Resolution 74, introduced by Representative BLANTON, of Texas, each of which directs the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House of Representatives information with respect to certain persons and corporations who own tax-exempt securities issued by the Federal Government. You state that the Committee on Ways and Means will be pleased to receive any comments or recommendations I may care to make with respect to the proposed legislation.

Section 257 of the Revenue Act of 1926, 44 Stat. 51, regulating the furnishing of information contained in income-tax returns, provides as follows:

"(b) (1) The Secretary and any officer or employee of the Treasury Department, upon request from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Finance of the Senate, or a select committee of the Senate or House specially authorized to investigate returns by a resolution of the Senate or House, or a joint committee so authorized by concurrent resolution, shall furnish such committee sitting in executive session with any data of any character contained in or shown by any return.

"(2) Any such committee shall have the right, acting directly as a committee, or by or through such examiners or agents as it may designate or appoint, to inspect any or all of the returns at such times and in such manner as it may determine.

"(3) Any relevant or useful information thus obtained may be submitted by the committee obtaining it to the Senate or the House, or to both the Senate and the House, as the case may be."

Section 22 (b) (4) of the Revenue Act of 1932, 47 Stat. 178, excludes from gross income interest on the securities of the United States or of its possessions. However, every person owning any such securities is required to submit in his return a statement indicating the number and amount of the securities owned by him and the income received therefrom. From the tax returns there is compiled for statistical purposes a statement reflecting the total amount of tax-exempt securities owned and the income derived therefrom by all taxpayers with incomes of \$5,000 or more per annum and this information could very conveniently be furnished, but to provide the information sought by the resolutions mentioned above with respect to individual taxpayers would require an examination of each and every tax return filed for the period for which such report is desired.

For the taxable year 1932 the individual returns filed to August 31, 1933, totaled 3,760,402, while the returns of corporations for the same year amounted to 481,368. For the taxable year 1933 the individual returns decreased slightly to 3,660,105, and the corporation returns were 472,174. The resolutions do not indicate whether the information is desired for a particular taxable year or for a period covering a number of taxable years. In any event it is at once apparent that the compilation of the data desired would require considerable time and involve great additional expense. It would necessitate a large expansion in the clerical force and would greatly handicap the Bureau at the present time. Numerous returns are located in the offices of the collectors of internal revenue throughout the country; others are in the hands

of revenue agents who are making audits of the books and records of the taxpayers; and a great many are in process of review in the local offices of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

For the reasons enumerated above I recommend that House Resolution 73 and House Resolution 74 be not adopted.

Very truly yours,

H. MORGENTHAU, Jr.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives.

In addition to the provisions of existing law cited by the Secretary of the Treasury, the committee also directs attention to section 3167 of the Revised Statutes, which provides as follows:

"Sec. 3167. It shall be unlawful for any collector, deputy collector, agent, clerk, or other officer or employee of the United States to divulge or to make known in any manner whatever not provided by law to any person the operations, style of work, or apparatus of any manufacturer or producer visited by him in the discharge of his official duties, or the amount or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or any particular thereof, set forth or disclosed in any income return, or to permit any income return or copy thereof or any book containing any abstract or particulars thereof to be seen or examined by any person except as provided by law; and it shall be unlawful for any person to print or publish in any manner whatever not provided by law any income return, or any part thereof or source of income, profits, losses, or expenditures appearing in any income return; and any offense against the foregoing provision shall be a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, at the discretion of the court; and if the offender be an officer or employee of the United States he shall be dismissed from office or discharged from employment."

House Resolution 74

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following information: The names and addresses of all persons and corporations who own tax-exempt securities, issued by the United States Government, in the aggregate amount of \$50,000 or over; the amount of such holdings held by each individual or corporation; kind of securities held in each case; and the interest paid on such securities per annum.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to my colleagues that this resolution was introduced by myself. I thought that this information regarding ownership of existing tax-exempt securities should have been gotten, and that we Members and the country were entitled to have it, hence I introduced the resolution; but the committee thinks that just now it is unwise to pass the resolution. I am convinced that just now they are right. I am perfectly willing to go along with the committee and wait later for the information, and allow the matter to be tabled at this time. Later we expect to get the information through the committee.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. COOPER of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. OLIVER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report on the bill (H. R. 5255) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 53), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BACON reserved all points of order.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next immediately after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts his reason for not speaking in general debate?

Mr. CONNERY. May I say to the gentleman from Colorado that I should like to have this time early in the day and

right at the start of the session because it is a very important matter which I want to discuss.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Of course, every Member should like to do the same thing.

Mr. CONNERY. In 12 years I have made this request just twice. I have never asked to speak under this sort of request except when I thought it was something very important.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, since it is possible that we may be able to pass the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor by Thursday night, I am wondering if it would be inconvenient to the gentleman to amend his request by making it Friday instead of Thursday.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I will amend my request to address the House on Friday instead of Thursday.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will not object, but I think it is very unfortunate to start this kind of practice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that on Friday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table, he may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that on the 30-hour week?

Mr. CONNERY. No.

Mr. BLANTON. We always like to hear the gentleman on any subject, although I am against his 30-hour-week bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOHN McDUFFIE

Mr. GUEVARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the appointment to the Federal bench of the United States of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE], Chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, and I also wish to state that my colleague from the Philippines [Commissioner DELGADO] fully agrees with the sentiment which I shall express in this regard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUEVARA. Mr. Speaker, the meritorious appointment to the Federal bench of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Mr. McDUFFIE, Chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of this House, is a matter of gratification and yet of deep sorrow to the Filipino people.

It is gratifying, for it is an acknowledgment of the ability and high integrity of the gentleman from Alabama. The Filipino people therefore cannot help rejoicing over his appointment as Federal judge, an honor bestowed only on those who have distinguished themselves in the legal profession. It is a sorrow to the people of the Philippine Islands, because they will be deprived of the unselfish and patriotic services of our beloved colleague Mr. McDUFFIE.

It is not inopportune at this time to state briefly the value of the gentleman from Alabama to the cause of the American and Filipino peoples. Public Act No. 127, Seventy-third Congress, commonly known as the "Tydings-McDuffie law", bears Mr. McDUFFIE's distinguished name. In the formulation of this bill—which is now a law—he devoted himself with an interest which characterized him as an American who had at heart the honor, prestige, and pride of his Nation. He is responsible for the addition of a new and glorious chapter in the history of the American people by sponsoring Public Act 127, Seventy-third Congress. This law enabled the people of the Philippines to draft their own constitution and institute, therefore, a government better suited to their genius and traditions. It also fixes the date when independence, to which the United States is committed, is to be granted. This action, culminated through the painstaking efforts of the gentleman from Alabama, is unparalleled in the history of mankind. His endeavors found response in a sympathetic Congress and administration, and their fruitful results will never be forgotten by the Filipino people.

This House will lose a valuable, intelligent, and brilliant Member. But the Nation will gain on its Federal bench

a man mentally qualified for the position and gifted with high character and honesty. Justice will be safe in his hands, and through him the citizens within his judicial district will find a full and impartial administration of justice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just a few more words of a personal nature. I have been associated with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE] ever since I was elected to this House in 1923. My closest relationship with him, however, started when he became the Chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs. I found in him a man who prizes the fulfillment of his duties more than anything else; but the quality I most admire in him is his profound devotion to American ideals, traditions, and principles. He inspired me to love America and the American people and to look to the future with confidence and to hope that the best interests of the Filipino people will be safeguarded by the United States in the days to come.

Mr. McDUFFIE, on behalf of the Filipino people and myself, we wish you success in your new office and assure you once more that your name will forever be in the heart of every Filipino. Our gratitude for what you have done for our country is boundless. Our only hope is that the day will come when we can show you our appreciation and gratitude.

EFFICIENCY OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS IN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the proposal to spend approximately \$5,000,000,000 for public works in order to produce employment and at the same time construct public improvements that are socially useful and of lasting benefit, it would be well for us to profit by experience. General Johnson in his article in the Saturday Evening Post of January 26, 1935, gives an interesting item of experience. He says:

If it were all to have been done over again, I would have written the statute to provide for an administrator with a small advisory board of the best construction experts in the country, but I would have used as executive officer Gen. Edward Markham, now Chief of Engineers of the United States Army.

I would have built the whole decentralized territorial organization upon the basis and the pattern of the existing system of the Engineer Corps, supplementing each district engineer with a staff of civilian engineers, architects, and construction experts. It would have saved enormously in overhead. It would have accelerated speed. It would have removed worry about speculation, favoritism, and graft.

Of course, General Johnson is correct about the organization of the Corps of Engineers. However, the fundamental and intrinsic value of that organization is derived from the hearts and souls of its individuals. An organization is what its individuals make it. The United States Army is what it is primarily because of the quality of its officers and soldiers, particularly its subaltern officers. The Army Engineer organization is our best governmental organization because its members are trained and imbued with the one idea of faithfulness to public trust. Take the same organization and fill the individual positions with gangsters or incompetents and the organization would collapse. The more competent the individuals of an organization the better the organization; but unless the individual executives are trained and imbued with the essential elements of public service, in the way that Army Engineers are trained and developed, no organization could approach in excellency the Army Engineer organization. If General Johnson means by "the basis and the pattern" the use of the Army Engineer personnel as well as its organization, then he has it right.

It is my hope that the administration in its difficult task of expending usefully, economically, and efficiently some \$5,000,000,000 of public money for public improvements will make the maximum use of the Army Engineers. An ideal organization for the purpose would be one built upon "the basis and the pattern" of the Army Engineers individually and collectively, that is the Army Engineer organization itself. If an Assistant Secretary of War should be placed in charge, he could direct the vast activities necessary, by using

in toto the Army Engineer organization. His small "advisory board" could be "the best construction experts in the country", namely, Army Engineer officers each supplemented with a staff of civilian engineers.

These times are like war times. Appropriations are being made in much the same way as they are made in war times. Why could not these public works be executed as construction is done in war? During the World War the Army Engineer organization expanded in record time from 277 officers to 8,000 officers. It immediately undertook work in magnitude many times greater than its greatest peacetime work. This organization was conceived and designed for just such a purpose. It is ready on instant notice to take on any quantity of construction work and expand as fast as may be necessary to accomplish the improvements desired with dispatch and efficiency. In conclusion let me say that whoever administers the vast sum being appropriated for public works, if he does not wish to travel a rough road, would do well to adopt the Army Engineers and their organization in toto, and to make the officers of the Corps of Engineers the controlling elements in both the distribution and the expenditure of the funds.

SHALL PRIVATE BUSINESS BE CRUSHED BY THE OCTOPUS OF BUREAUCRACY?

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker and Members, the accepted axiom that if you give some individuals an inch they will be asking for a mile is typically illustrated here in the city of Washington, where the emergency bureaucrats holding high, sinecure, patronage positions are continually endeavoring to develop their individual activities, regardless of the effect which it may have upon the Nation's welfare.

I wish to register my individual protest against the expenditure of as huge an amount of money as is provided in House Joint Resolution 117, if such expenditures are to be made through the medium of day labor under the auspices of the incompetents who appear to infest the various emergency bureaus here in Washington.

If we are to maintain American wage standards and an American standard of living, and, most essential, if we are to maintain the morale of our workers, I would strongly urge that expenditures made under the authority of House Joint Resolution 117 be made, as much as practicable, on a strictly competitive basis, in accordance with existing business practices; that is, the posting of proposals and the execution of contracts predicated upon a just wage scale and a fair profit to the contractor.

BOULDER DAM STRIKING EXAMPLE OF PRIVATE EFFICIENCY

The remarkable record of efficiency in the construction of Boulder Dam under private auspices is in striking contrast to the wasteful inefficiency of the Reedsville subsistence homestead project. The Boulder Dam project, one of the largest in history, will be completed 2 years ahead of schedule, thereby affording the residents of the lower Colorado Basin two full seasons of flood control and protection not originally contemplated.

During the last year in the emergency highway-construction program the construction industry completed \$400,000,000 worth of highways throughout the country in record time. Its enormous facilities should be utilized by the Government in its work program to rout unemployment and to end depression. Governmental competition in the private construction field would not only bring disaster to the construction industry, with consequent economic distress to the thousands of its employees, but it would entail unnecessary delay in the execution of the projects and thus lessen and jeopardize the efficacy of the entire program. The work program must be put into effect with all possible speed in order to relieve the distress of our people. To this end efficiency demands that we utilize immediately existing facilities and that, instead of crippling an industry of such

vital importance as is the construction industry, the Federal Government join hands with private industry for their mutual benefit and the best interests of the Nation.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair inform the House whether or not the Home Owners' Loan Corporation bill is coming up today or when we may expect it to come up? The reason I ask this question is because on Friday afternoon and Saturday morning it was published in the Washington papers that this measure was going to be indefinitely postponed. It would be a very serious matter to have it postponed, because there are thousands of good citizens losing their homes every day that this bill is held up, and I would appeal to the Speaker and to the Congress to get this bill before the House as soon as possible so as to save the thousands of homes throughout the country that are threatened with foreclosure. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that the bill cannot come up today, because it has not been reported by the committee having it under consideration.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] if it is his purpose to take up this afternoon the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor?

Mr. OLIVER. It is; and I should like to ask the gentlemen who want time to let the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], as well as myself, know about it, so that we may yield them time today and tomorrow.

Mr. BACON. That will be entirely satisfactory. I have had some requests for time, and I wanted to be in position to inform the Members of the House with respect to the matter.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on House Joint Resolution 88, making additional appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, the National Mediation Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) making additional appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, the National Mediation Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate amending the title of the joint resolution.

J. P. BUCHANAN,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
W. B. OLIVER,
ROBERT L. BACON,
Managers on
the part of the House.
ALVA B. ADAMS,
CARTER GLASS,
FREDERICK HALE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to House Joint Resolution No. 88, making additional

appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, the National Mediation Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

On nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, relating to the Senate: Appropriates \$140,000 for miscellaneous items, \$75,000 for expenses of inquiries and investigations, and inserts the paragraphs prescribing when salaries of Senators filling vacancies or succeeding appointees to the Senate shall start, all as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 5: Appropriates \$4,000, as proposed by the Senate, for additional expenses of the District of Columbia-Virginia Boundary Commission.

On no. 6: Appropriates \$900,000 instead of \$825,000, as proposed by the House, and \$975,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses (exclusive of printing and binding) for the Securities and Exchange Commission.

On no. 7: Inserts the section, proposed by the Senate, eliminating, effective April 1, 1935, the remaining 5-percent reduction in compensation of officers and employees.

Inserts the amendment of the Senate amending the title of the joint resolution.

J. P. BUCHANAN,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
W. B. OLIVER,
ROBERT L. BACON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, if there are no questions, we may as well vote on the report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor which is holding hearings on unemployment-insurance legislation may be permitted to sit while the House is in session until further notice.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what bills his committee is considering?

Mr. CONNERY. This is a subcommittee which is considering the Lundeen bill and other unemployment-insurance bills.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think it is rather unusual to request such permission "until further notice."

Mr. CONNERY. They expect to have these hearings for about 10 days.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Why not ask permission for 1 week?

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN] is chairman of the subcommittee; and in view of the gentleman's statement, I will ask the permission for 10 days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on February 22, Washington's Birthday, immediately after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, someone may be designated by the Speaker to read Washington's Farewell Address in the House.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say to my friend from Mississippi that I had the honor of reading that address a few years ago.

Mr. RANKIN. So did I.

Mr. CONNERY. And the gentleman from Mississippi should be commended for his patriotic devotion in this matter, especially since that wonderful victory in another body a few days ago, keeping America out of trouble.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House, this is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill upon the calendar.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The first bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4005) to amend section of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to the time of making the annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 21 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The Commission shall, on or before the 1st day of January of each year, make a report which shall be transmitted to Congress and copies of which shall be distributed as are the other reports transmitted to Congress."

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, I think there must be some Members here who would like to know the reason for this amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is for the reason that Congress does not meet in December.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I withdraw the reservation.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "1st" and insert "3d."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO REPEAL CITIZENSHIP STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIEN SEAMEN WHO HAVE NOT BECOME NATURALIZED AS CITIZENS

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 67) to repeal certain laws providing that certain aliens who have filed declarations of intention to become citizens of the United States shall be considered citizens for the purposes of service and protection on American vessels.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision eighth of section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization and to provide a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States", as amended by section 1 of the act entitled "An act to amend the naturalization laws and to repeal certain sections of the Revised Statutes of the United States and other laws relating to naturalization, and for other purposes", approved May 9, 1918 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 376), is hereby repealed.

Sec. 2. This act shall take effect 90 days after its enactment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] to explain the necessity for this change, and I will ask him if there are any changes proposed that will loosen up or let down the bars of immigration?

Mr. BLAND. On the contrary, the effect of this bill will be to tighten up the bars. I have information not contained in the hearings that at the Port of New York alone these 3-year certificate men filled 8,970 jobs that would have been filled by American labor if the law which we seek to repeal had not been on the statute books.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The bill proposes that if these men are employed on these jobs they must be citizens.

Mr. BLAND. That is true. At the present time, notwithstanding the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, which requires that on ocean mail vessels two-thirds of the crew shall be American citizens a crew may be made up of aliens entirely, and for this reason; if one-third of the crew is permitted to be aliens the other two-thirds may be these 3-year certificate men and you will have 100 percent aliens. Notwithstanding the fact that the law requires that 66 2/3 percent shall be Americans.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I notice the report says the bill was passed twice previously. If that is true, is this bill now in the exact language of the other bills?

Mr. BLAND. The bill now before the House is in the exact language of the bills passed heretofore. The bill passed the House in the Seventy-second Congress without objection. It passed the House in the Seventy-third Congress without objection. In other words, this bill has passed the House in two Congresses by unanimous consent.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will yield, I am in sympathy with this bill. If you could get a law authorizing 100-percent Americans on a vessel I would be in favor of it.

The gentleman knows that all it requires to file a declaration of intention is to walk into the United States Court, go to the clerk's office, tell the people there the name of the ship you came over on, sign your name, and regardless of whatever conditions may arise, that man is a declarant. A man can arrive in the United States this morning and in half an hour be taken to a Federal building and declare his intention to become a citizen, and nobody can stop him.

Mr. BLAND. That may be true, but we have nothing to do with that.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then what protection have you?

Mr. BLAND. In this bill we are seeking to prevent those men who, in addition to that, may have had 3 years of service on American ships from being classed as American citizens.

Mr. COCHRAN. The mere fact that they file a declaration to become American citizens means nothing, because they can do it within half an hour after they arrive in the country.

Mr. BLAND. That is true; but under the existing law, passed in 1918, those men, if they serve 3 years on an American merchant ship or an American fishing ship, are then declared by statute to be American citizens for the purpose of the American merchant marine.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then we ought to repeal the law.

Mr. BLAND. This bill seeks to repeal that law.

Mr. COCHRAN. We should repeal it and put more teeth in the law and keep them off altogether.

Mr. BLAND. This bill does that so far as the proportion of 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent to be American citizens under the Merchant Marine Act of 1928.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. Can the gentleman tell us a little about the circumstances that led to the writing of the law in the first place?

Mr. BLAND. It was written in 1918, reported from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, at a time when we were building a merchant marine for war purposes, and when it was evidently thought we did not have the men to go on the ships. A very large fleet was being constructed in 1918, and the law was passed to man those ships, when we were in war. The law ought to have been repealed long ago, and when the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 was passed requiring that 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent of the crews should be American citizens, it was not in the contemplation of the committee that that 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent should be made up of these so-called "3-year-certificate men."

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. BACON. I think the gentleman is to be heartily commended for bringing in this legislation. I am informed by reliable people in the merchant-marine business in the United States that today there is absolutely no difficulty in getting 100-percent American crews. I was told by one big ship man today that he had applications from many college graduates for positions on his boats as seamen, and I think we have an opportunity at this time to build up a real merchant-marine service, manned by 100-percent Americans.

Mr. BLAND. If this bill, which passed the House in the last Congress, had gotten through the Senate and had been on the statute books, many of the men who were employed on the *Morro Castle* could not have been employed there.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Does not the gentleman think it advisable to remove this advantage given to aliens wherein the existing law provides it is not necessary for them to file a declaration of intention previous to the expiration of their 3 years' service?

Mr. BLAND. This does away with the whole thing. They have to become naturalized citizens. If this bill passes, they have not only to file a declaration of intention but must become American citizens, going through the second process.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand they have to be American citizens before they can go on the American merchant marine.

Mr. BLAND. Not necessarily, but before they can be classed in the 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They must file their declaration of intention?

Mr. BLAND. They must become American citizens if this bill becomes a law.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They are outside of the 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent, then, although they have filed their intention to become citizens.

Mr. BLAND. Outside of that, but they could come in as an additional one-third under the Merchant Marine Act. That act would have to be amended as to that provision to prevent that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then, instead of giving the job to aliens, this is raising the number of American citizens in the quota.

Mr. BLAND. Yes. Last year from the port of New York over 8,000 jobs that went to these men would have gone to American citizens, naturalized or natives. Multiplied by the other ports in the country, it can be seen what that would amount to.

Mr. BACON. I am informed that one large shipping institution employs 100-percent American citizens.

Mr. BLAND. I understand that is true, but we want to reach those who do not.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I am thinking of these aliens who have filed their declaration to become citizens. They have had 3 years' experience. It seems to me that they should not be thrown out in the cold and treated as aliens, because eventually they intend to become citizens. They are also in need of employment, and I wish the gentleman would let the bill go over without prejudice so that I could satisfy myself along this line.

Mr. BLAND. This does not prevent their going into the one-third, but the evidence before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization shows that those men never intend to become American citizens. This is confirmed by information that has come to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

Mr. KVALE. I am not pleading their cause, but I am thinking of the others who do intend to become American citizens.

Mr. BLAND. What we want to do is to carry out the purpose of the Merchant Marine Act that they shall be naturalized or native American citizens.

Now, if a ship is not operating under an ocean mail contract or with a construction loan, the only law that is applicable to that ship is that 75 percent of the deck crew shall understand the orders of the officers. It does not affect them; also that 65 percent of the deck crew shall be able-bodied seamen. It does not prevent the employment on that class of ship. It only relates to ships operating with an ocean mail contract or with a construction loan.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision "Eighth" of section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization and to provide a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States", as amended by section 1 of the act entitled "An act to amend the naturalization laws and to repeal certain sections of the Revised Statutes of the United States and other laws relating to naturalization, and for other purposes", approved May 9, 1918 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 376), is hereby repealed.

Sec. 2. This act shall take effect 90 days after its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire if the Speaker is in a position to inform the House whether there will be any bills taken up under suspension this afternoon?

The SPEAKER. I believe there is one and, perhaps, two.

Mr. SNELL. Can the Speaker tell us what they will be, at the present time?

The SPEAKER. Unless unanimous consent is secured, one is a bill offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], making authorization with reference to control of germs which are affecting oysters.

There is another bill to which the attention of the gentleman has been called by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

CONSENT CALENDAR

BRIDGE ACROSS SNAKE RIVER, CLARKSTON, WASH., AND LEWISTON, IDAHO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2030, authorizing the States of Washington and Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Snake River between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, I do this just to state that the policy on the Republican side with reference to bridge bills is going to be that we will have no opposition and do not intend to oppose any bills where municipalities or States or other political subdivisions are asking permission to build a bridge. We might be compelled at some time or other to object to permits to private individuals or to concerns who are asking for them for the purpose of peddling them around to sell.

I take it from the title of the bill that this is one in which two States are interested?

Mr. CHAPMAN. It authorizes the State of Washington and the State of Idaho to construct a free highway bridge.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. With that information, we have no objection and I will withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the States of Washington and Idaho be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the States of Washington and Idaho all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS ELEVEN POINTS RIVER, OREGON COUNTY, MO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2374, granting the consent of Congress to the State highway commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Eleven Points River in section 17, township 23 north, range 2 west, approximately 12 miles east of Alton, on route no. 42, Oregon County, Mo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State Highway Commission of Missouri to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Eleven Points River in section 17, township 23 north, range 2 west, approximately 12 miles east of Alton, on route no. 42 in Oregon County, Mo., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "bridge", insert the words "and approaches thereto."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "navigation", insert the words "at or near Alton, Mo."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. LAWRENCE RIVER NEAR ALEXANDRIA BAY, N. Y.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3018, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N. Y., authorized to be built by the New York Development Association, Inc., a corporation organized under and by virtue of the membership corporation law of the State of New York, its successors and assigns, by an act of Congress approved March 4, 1929, and heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved February 13, 1931, and further heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved April 15, 1932, and heretofore further extended by acts of Congress approved February 14, 1933, and February 26, 1934, are hereby further extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from March 4, 1935.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 2, after the word "by", strike out the words "an act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "acts."

Page 2, line 3, after the figures "1932", strike out the words "and heretofore further extended by acts of Congress approved."

Page 2, line 6, after the word "from", strike out the words "March 4" and insert in lieu thereof "February 26."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS ARKANSAS RIVER NEAR KEOTA, OKLA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3057, granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oklahoma for constructing a bridge across the Arkansas River south of the town of Sallisaw in Sequoyah and Le Flore Counties at a point approximately 15 miles north of Keota in the State of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Oklahoma to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Arkansas River at a point approximately 15 miles north of the town of Keota and suitable to the interests of navigation, in section 9, township 10 north, range 24 east, south of the town of Sallisaw, in the counties of Sequoyah and Le Flore, in the State of Oklahoma, and conformable to United States Public Works Highway Project No. NRS 412-B (1935), in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, after the word "a", insert the words "free highway."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oklahoma to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Arkansas River south of the town of Sallisaw in Sequoyah and Le Flore Counties at a point approximately 15 miles north of Keota in the State of Oklahoma."

BRIDGE ACROSS DAN RIVER AT DANVILLE, VA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3983, to legalize a bridge across the Dan River at Danville, Va.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman from Virginia tell us why it is necessary to get authorization at this time? I understand from the report that this is the reconstruction of an old bridge.

Mr. BURCH. They are reconstructing an old bridge.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is this authorization requested to comply with a mere technicality?

Mr. BURCH. It results from a technicality in the law.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They went ahead on the assumption they had the authority because they had authority to build the original bridge; is that right?

Mr. BURCH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CHAPMAN. This is a Federal-aid bridge.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a free bridge or a toll bridge?

Mr. BURCH. It is a free bridge.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the bridge (known as the "Union Street Bridge") now being reconstructed across the Dan River at Danville, Va., if completed in accordance with the plans accepted by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War as providing suitable facilities for navigation and operated as a free bridge shall be a lawful structure, and shall be subject to the conditions and limitations of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906 (U. S. C., title 33, secs. 491 to 498, inclusive), other than those requiring the approval of plans by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers before the bridge is commenced.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS WACCAMAW RIVER AT CONWAY, S. C.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3891, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Waccamaw River at Conway, S. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Waccamaw River at Conway, S. C., authorized to be built by the State of South Carolina, by an act of Congress approved February 10, 1932, heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved May 12, 1933, are hereby further extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERADICATION OF MARINE ORGANISMS INJURIOUS TO SHELLFISH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4018, to provide for the investigation, control, and eradication of marine organisms injurious to shellfish in the Atlantic and Gulf States.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I think I shall object, and I shall give my reasons:

In the first place this bill calls for an authorization of \$500,000. We who are charged with the responsibility of handling the Consent Calendar bills think that, because of the large amount involved the bill requires full debate, and have heretofore usually had a standard beyond which we seldom go. The purpose of the Consent Calendar is to expedite the passage of meritorious bills to which there is no objection. I think this bill is one that could well come up under suspension of the rules when we can have more time to discuss it.

Another ground of objection is that I notice as a reason given for favorable consideration is the fact that heretofore we have spent \$10,000,000 for the eradication of the European corn borer and \$5,000,000 for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly. I do not think either of those are good reasons for the expenditure of the money asked to be authorized in the pending bill. For if no more real value is received from this expenditure than was received from those expenditures, all of us should be against it.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am, of course, very strongly for this bill; and I hope the gentleman from Ohio will be when he hears it discussed.

But I want to concur in what the gentleman from Ohio has just said, that never should any Member of this House permit a bill carrying \$500,000 to go through by unanimous consent. I think the gentleman is correct in objecting to it; but we will take it up under suspension in just a few minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina that personally I shall have no objection to the bill after legitimate and careful consideration; but the bill carries too great an authorization to pass by unanimous consent.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from North Carolina will withhold his objection, and referring to the \$10,000,000 that was spent for the eradication of the European corn borer, I happen to have had something to do with that in the State of Ohio and am sorry to inform my friend from Virginia that the eradication was a failure. I fear very much that this may have a similar result.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4018) to provide for the investigation, control, and eradication of marine organisms injurious to shellfish in the Atlantic and Gulf States.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to enable the Secretary of Commerce to meet the emergency caused by the rapid increase and continuous spread of the leech, starfish, borers, and other pests injurious to oysters, clams, and scallops in the waters of the Atlantic and Gulf States, by conducting such investigations and experiments as may be necessary to determine the best methods of controlling these pests; by the immediate application of such measures of control as in his judgment may be effective, including payments for the removal of various pests of oysters, clams, and scallops in such amounts and under such regulations as he may prescribe.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the situation which is brought to the attention of the House in this bill may be considered as analogous to a raging fire. The problem which immediately confronts one in the latter case is to put out the fire and then to find remedies against a repetition of the fire. The particular pests to which this bill is now more particularly directed are the wafer or leech in the South Atlantic and Gulf waters, the starfish in the North Atlantic and mid-Atlantic waters, and the screw borer or drill in the mid-Atlantic waters. The starfish and the screw borer or drill extend along practically the entire Atlantic coast. There have been in the past attempts to control some of these pests. They do not know State lines, they refuse to recognize boundaries, and they have been spreading until now a large area has been destroyed.

Let me call attention first to the situation as it exists in the Florida waters. In 1906 the wafer or leech appeared in the Indian River in Florida. This pest is about the size of a nickel and is really a round, flat worm. It has the thickness of a sheet of paper or about that thickness. In 1906 when it first appeared it destroyed the beds in Indian River. It did not appear again until 1916, and then it destroyed the oysters in that area. In January 1932 an examination was made of beds for other purposes in Apalachicola Bay, Fla., where are to be found the largest and most valuable oyster beds in the State. At that time they found none of these pests, but by December of that year it had made its appearance and destroyed very large and valuable beds.

At the end of 1934 this pest, which was found in Apalachicola Bay in the fall of 1932, had destroyed 800 acres of the most valuable oyster beds down there. They were absolutely destroyed. The witnesses who appeared before the committee said there was not a living oyster to be found in these 800 acres. It has found its way west as far as the State of

Texas. It has been found in Alabama. It has found its way north as far as Pamlico Sound, in the State of North Carolina.

It is not migratory in character, but it propagates itself very much as does the oyster, and that is by a floating organism or spawn in water which attaches itself to hard substances. It attaches itself to the barnacles and shells on the bottom of vessels plying those waters, and having been found north as far as Pamlico Sound and as far west as Texas, if it continues its ravages and its depredations with the same degree of speed it has in the past, it may soon sweep the Atlantic coast and destroy the oyster beds. The operation of this pest, and, in fact, all of the other pests, is of greater force against seed oysters than against the larger oysters, though it destroys both. With the seed oysters it will destroy a larger number in a shorter space of time.

The starfish is found in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and on down the coast. It has five points; it is a shellfish. It fixes itself upon the outside of the oyster, and feeds upon the oyster. It has been doing considerable damage. The screw borer or drill is a marine snail that implants itself upon the shell of the oyster, drills a hole, and destroys the oyster. Some of the largest beds in Virginia, New Jersey, and other States have been destroyed in this way.

You ask me what is the remedy? As to the wafer or leech, that can be conquered by taking up the shells.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. May I ask the gentleman whether or not we tax these oyster beds in any way that might help to put money back in the Treasury that we would take out under this program? It looks like we ought to make this proposition self supporting.

Mr. BLAND. The United States has no tax on these beds any more than it has upon farm lands or various other things that have been menaced in the past and for which relief has been granted when it is a problem, not local in character but national in scope.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. These oysters are an essential and necessary element in the national diet?

Mr. BLAND. The Nation as a whole does not recognize the importance of the oyster as a food. It is an important part of the food supply of the Nation. There is available information, through the Bureau of Fisheries, which shows its value as a food.

May I add right here that with all of the appropriations that have been made for agriculture and for every other thing in the Government, only \$12,000 is appropriated annually for the study of oysters and the correction of pests on fish.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am in full sympathy with the gentleman's effort. The time to start is now. In looking at the hearings held by the Committee on Appropriations just completed, I note that the Bureau of Fisheries make absolutely no comment in reference to this condition which exists along the Atlantic seaboard and in the Gulf States. This is too important a matter to let drift, and the sooner they get to work the better it will be for all concerned.

Mr. BLAND. The hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries, which have been made available today, show that Mr. Jackson, Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Fisheries, and several representatives of that Bureau were present. The distribution of the money which would be used in this appropriation is set up by Mr. Jackson.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am sorry that is not in the report. I think it would have helped the gentleman's cause.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CALDWELL. Is it not a fact that the condition which prevails in connection with the oyster industry was not called

to the attention of the Bureau of Fisheries until after the Budget had been made up and until after the hearings had been held?

Mr. BLAND. Yes; that is true. The hearings we held were the outgrowth of a group of meetings of various representatives along the Atlantic coast held 2 days before, when the evidence that was presented showed that the situation was so menacing that we immediately introduced a bill and held hearings within 2 days.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BACON. Supplementing what the gentleman said, may I call attention to the fact there was no authorization of law which would have permitted the Committee on Appropriations to go into this situation. If this bill is passed, there will be an authorization of law, and then the Committee on Appropriations may make the necessary appropriation.

Mr. BLAND. I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] that the reason we did not immediately go to the Committee on Appropriations was that we recognized that there was no existing law and that there should be law in order to authorize the Committee on Appropriations to make an appropriation.

Mr. BACON. For this reason the Bureau of Fisheries did not call the situation to our attention.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to take up any time myself with respect to this bill except to say that I am in hearty accord with it, and I think that there exists very substantial reasons for the speedy enactment of this bill. While the ravages of this wafer or leech at the present time is more particularly felt in southern waters, yet, as the gentleman from Virginia explained, in a short time it will embrace the entire Atlantic coast; and if something is not done, it will probably cause destruction of the oyster permanently on the Atlantic coast of the United States.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. May I ask if the report indicates whether or not this is contrary to the financial policy of the administration?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I do not think this was referred to the Bureau of the Budget, and I do not know whether that policy is now in existence with respect to every bill as it has been in years past. In any event, I do not know whether the Budget has ever been asked to consider this proposition or not. Undoubtedly, before an appropriation is made, and after the authorization which is all this bill contains, the Bureau of the Budget will be consulted.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If the gentleman will permit, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not during the hearings or at any other time it was brought out whether this bill is in accordance with the financial program of the administration?

Mr. BLAND. I may say to the gentleman that if my house were burning down I would not wait to ask the Bureau of the Budget to approve methods of stopping the fire. This was not considered by the Bureau of the Budget. We consider ourselves a legislative committee, and it is not necessary to submit our bills to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mrs. KAHN. Will the gentleman from New Jersey yield so that I may ask the gentleman from Virginia a question?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mrs. KAHN. Why is the authorization confined to investigation on the Atlantic coast and among the Gulf States and does not include the Pacific coast?

Mr. BLAND. I will say to the gentleman from California that I asked the question at the committee hearing:

Are any of these pests found on the western coast?

Dr. PRYTHORCH. Not according to our records. The borer has been carried, I believe, to the west coast in shipments of oysters from the Atlantic coast, but it does not constitute at the present time a very serious problem out there.

The CHAIRMAN. But it may grow and may develop?

Dr. PRYTHERCH. Yes. They spend a great amount of time in caring for their beds, and most of the beds are bare at low tide, and they are enclosed in dikes, where they can easily collect the drills that are on the oysters.

There was a different situation on the Pacific coast. There was no request from the Pacific coast and the evidence showed that this condition did not exist then on the Pacific coast but showed further that unless this menace were met the Pacific coast would also be threatened.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. SUTPHIN. I understand that part of this money is going to be used to eliminate the starfish and borer, which is more destructive to oysters in the northern waters at the present time than the leech.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes; and I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, before I yield any further time, that the oyster and other shell fishermen, with respect to their beds, occupy precisely the same position as the farmer to his land and crops. He pays the same taxes on his property as the farmer; he is entitled to the protection of the Government against a destruction of his crop and of the value of his land just precisely as is the farmer. The products of his labor and of his holdings are just as valuable to the people of the country as the products of the holdings and the labor of the farmers.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. It appeared from the evidence, as the gentleman recalls, that the oyster industry is the second largest fishing industry in the United States, ranking second to salmon.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, as an oyster grower for many years, I wish that I might have a longer time to tell about this industry that needs assistance. It is the second largest fishing industry ranking next to the salmon industry. At the present time the situation is most discouraging.

In the olden times nearly all the harbors and rivers along the coast were natural oyster beds, but in recent years, since the manufacturing plants have emptied poisonous matter into the bays, it is becoming difficult to find proper places to propagate the oyster. When you spend a lot of money on your leases and suddenly find your product with a little worm boring quietly into it and practically ruining your whole bed, you realize the need of assistance. When you find coming in from the ocean vast hordes of these five-fingered things called "starfish", creeping over the beds, you again need immediate aid; and it should be given by State or Federal funds.

As someone has already said, these pests do not know State lines. One of my own towns last year spent a lot of money, and my State also spent a lot of money to eradicate these pests. The E. R. A. furnished some funds and millions of bushels of starfish were removed from certain areas. It does not seem right for one town or one State to have to put up its money when such pests do not recognize State lines.

This is a matter for the Federal Government, and, as I have often said before, it has been a disgrace that in years past, with all the money appropriated here for agriculture, the fishermen, and especially the shell fishermen, have received so little.

For 2 or 3 years I followed carefully Professor Goldstoffs experiments on the oyster. He found out many things of great interest. We have had to learn through hard experience and at much expense how to raise oysters, and now need help to protect them from all these various pests that infest them.

It is time for Congress to give greater recognition to the shell fisheries and the other fisheries as well. Twelve thou-

sand dollars is all that has been allowed for this very important industry.

There are many things pertaining to the industry that ought to be discussed here. I am sure you would prefer to pay 30 cents for a half dozen fairly good-sized oysters on the shell than pay 30 cents for a plate of soup. When the oyster is in good condition there is nothing that compares with it as a delicious food. The oyster is food par excellence. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak sincerely about this matter from my own long and bitter experience. This is an industry that needs help and needs it badly, and it is an industry that ought to be preserved.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman has been in the business of fighting these pests in the oyster trade?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; the fight has been a losing one. We can simply stand by and watch the devastation. There has not been very much that we have been able to do. Research has, indeed, helped much; and this \$12,000, may I tell the House, has done much in showing how to raise the seed from the spawn. But the industry needs money now to stop this conflagration, as the gentleman from Virginia has expressed it.

Now, we do not want this leech, so-called, to get up North if it can be prevented. We have troubles enough with the borer and the starfish without having any more pests.

Mr. Speaker, I see that my time has expired. I wish I could have had time to speak at length on the value of this most important industry. [Applause.]

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX].

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I must be the one to oppose this measure. In the first place recently we have heard considerable criticism and condemnation about the manner in which the \$4,000,000,000 Public Works bill was passed. I think we would be liable to the same criticism if we passed this appropriation of \$500,000 for the benefit of the oyster growers, without more information as to the manner in which this money is to be expended.

As I noted a while ago in the report, it cites precedents of former appropriations made by Congress for the relief of certain industries and for the eradication of certain diseases or pests with reference to the plant industry and the livestock industry.

The first item cited is that of 1925 for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, appropriating \$3,500,000. That was an open and shut proposition. It was purely and simply a process of eradication by killing the diseased animals by thorough disinfection. This is no such proposition.

The second remedy listed is for the eradication of these borers which pertain to oysters—not corn. They say this, "The borers have a tendency to climb above the beds for laying eggs so that hundreds of thousands of borers may be collected in this way, and then removed from the traps when lifted from the water and shaken."

I asked the sponsor of the bill, "How in the name of everything that is sensible and reasonable are you going to guarantee a permanent eradication in that way?"

We had the same thing to contend with in the European corn borer. I was secretary of the International Association for the Eradication of the Corn Borer. I was one of the committee of three. There were two others, Dean Curtis, of the College of Agriculture at Ames, Iowa, and the other George Christie, director of the experiment station at Purdue, Ind., and our committee of three obtained an approval by President Coolidge for \$10,000,000 appropriation which Congress granted. The plan was to spend 80 percent of the appropriation with the farmers themselves, as is proposed in this case by the oyster farmers.

But when the appropriation was made the administration was turned over to bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture, and instead of spending \$8,000,000 with the farmers, as the committee proposed and as President Coolidge approved, the first act of the bureaucrats in the Department of

Agriculture was to expend \$3,000,000 with the International Harvester Co. and with Mr. Ford and John Deere for machinery. This machinery was used only about 2 months, and the greater part of it today is stored in Government Army warehouses. What assurance have we that this appropriation, if granted, will not be handled in the same manner by the bureaucrats in the Bureau of Fisheries.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRUAX. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly in his diagnosis of this proposition, that the corn-borer eradication was a total failure. Am I correct in the thought that practically nine-tenths of the endeavor to eradicate the corn borer was carried on in the State of Ohio?

Mr. TRUAX. I would not say whether 90 percent was used there.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I am in sympathy with the problems of these oyster growers, but I think this proposition should be given more time and study, and that the Bureau of Fisheries should present to us a workable, practical program, which will accomplish something besides merely giving something else to do to the bureaucrats of the Bureau of Fisheries.

Mr. LEHLBACH. And what will become of the oysters in the meantime?

Mr. TRUAX. What has become of them in the past?

Mr. LEHLBACH. This pest is just recent, and time is of the essence in stopping it.

Mr. TRUAX. I think this whole thing is undertaken too hastily. I beg with the gentleman to give us more time to work out a real program.

This is a bill to provide for the investigation, control, and eradication of marine organisms injurious to shellfish in Atlantic and Gulf States. We are told that the oyster industry is a phase of agriculture, that the fishermen farm the seas, the lakes, the rivers. Even so, that does not make it an industry as important to the Nation as a whole as agriculture is. If this bill were to benefit the farmers as a class or American agriculture as a whole, then I should support it. Since, however, it benefits only a very small and specialized class of producers I cannot justify it from an economic standpoint, from the viewpoint of the American taxpayer, nor can I approve of the method in which it is being railroaded through the House of Representatives. If it is of benefit to agriculture, why was it not included in the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture or why was it not included in the appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce where it could be given careful consideration and approval or disapproval of the Committee on Appropriations?

Webster defines shellfish, "Any aquatic invertebrate animal having a shell, esp., a mollusk or a crustacean." The word "mollusk" is defined as "any kind of a large phylum containing most of the animals popularly called shellfish except crustaceans and having a soft unsegmented body protected in most cases by a calcareous shell. It comprises the slugs, snails, mussels, clams, oysters, whelks, limpets, cuttlefishes, etc." The word "mollusk" is further defined by Webster as "Mollusca, a kind of soft nut." Far be it from me to even refer or to allude to Members of this body who are asked to vote for a \$500,000 authorization to relieve and save the noble oyster now in deep, dire distress, without even dotting an "i" or crossing a "t", as belonging to that latter specie.

Some may justify their vote for this bill by recalling lines 5 and 6 of the bill, "the sum of \$500,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary." Not I, however, I beg to state, since past experience and observation teach me that Federal bureaucrats invariably spend the last dollar allotted to them by Congress. If we are to authorize \$500,000 to relieve the

oyster, why not be equally solicitous for the clams, mussels, snails, lobsters, shrimp, and so forth. I admire the benevolence of the committee, and respect their generosity, but decry the ease with which such appropriations are obtained and the method of legislating. Like a bolt out of the clear sky we are asked to authorize the sum of \$500,000, by unanimous consent of the Members, to stop the "continuous spread of the leech, starfish, borer, and other pests injurious to oysters, clams, and scallops in the waters of the Atlantic and Gulf States." Then when objection is interposed, we are asked to suspend the rules of the House of Representatives and pass this bill by a two-thirds vote of the membership.

This in the face of Nation-wide unemployment, with universal bankruptcy confronting farmers and small business men. This with the knowledge that 20,000,000 people are on State and Federal relief and that every dollar is needed to feed the hungry and clothe the naked. Had a practical, workable plan been presented, then a vote for this bill might be justified, but no such plan is offered; no official recommendation from the United States Bureau of Fisheries, who is to administer the funds if finally enacted, has to my knowledge been received. The proponents say that it is an emergency and that quick action is necessary. I deny this and challenge their statement that it is an emergency. I predict that this sporadic and ill-considered attempt to eradicate the shell borer will be fully as abortive as the \$10,000,000 experiment in 1927 to eradicate the European corn borer.

On page 3 of the report to accompany H. R. 4018 we are informed: "These pests are found in all Atlantic States, and in Gulf waters, though in some areas devastation is more pronounced than in others. This pest is migratory, and also it is possible may be carried on the bottom of vessels." These two statements prove my contention that no workable, practical plan is now devised. The fact that the pest has existed for years in all waters bordering the Atlantic States and in Gulf waters, and that the pest migrates on the bottom of vessels, proves conclusively that human agencies, traps, and contrivances will be no more successful in stopping this aquatic nuisance by the Bureau of Fisheries than were the ill-fated efforts and endeavors of the bug hunters and bureaucrats of the Department of Agriculture in stopping the migrations of the European corn-borer moth.

The word "barnacles" has several times been injected into this debate. That is a word I understand and particularly when applied to this bill. The authorization by this Congress of \$500,000 to relieve the American oyster, while national discord brews and human revolt fomented, will simply be another one of the many, many barnacles fastened on American taxpayers by an all-too-willing legislative body.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not need more than 3 minutes as all that I know about the matter has been told by others. Complaints are coming to me from the Texas coasts of the pests now destroying oysters there. The drill of which you have heard has been in existence there for several years, but the leech or wafer is just beginning to make its appearance. I attended the committee hearings during the hearings on the bill, and from the evidence developed there, as well as that which has been sent to me from Texas, I am thoroughly convinced that some steps must be taken, else one of our most valuable industries will soon be destroyed. There are other enemies in the way of pollution by oil, acid, and various other substances that have destroyed the oyster beds in great part.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KLEBERG. To suggest another great difficulty which we found under the coordination bill passed by the last Congress, and that is the oversalinity of many of these waters, which has killed out gigantic beds all up and down the Texas coast.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am informed that that is correct; and unless the Congress takes the necessary steps to protect

that industry, it is going to deteriorate until people who like to eat oysters all over this land will be very much disappointed in a few years.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. Is it not true also that the destruction of the beds will wipe out and destroy a group of citizens who work hard, whose means of livelihood is hazardous, and whose whole investment will be destroyed if this is not done?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman is correct. A question was asked a while ago by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. KAHN] why this bill does not extend to the Pacific coast. These pests have not yet become known there. They were not known in the western portion of the Gulf of Mexico until recently, but as sure as time goes on I believe they will make their appearance in the Pacific waters in the next year or two if they are not stopped.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLAND rose.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Virginia begins, will he yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I have been reading the report of the gentleman's committee, and there is nowhere in that report any statement that the expenditure of this fund will in any way accomplish the removal of the pest, nor is there any statement that would justify such a large expenditure of funds. Can the gentleman supply that?

Mr. BLAND. I should be glad to have the gentleman read the hearings on the bill. Although we have tried to get the hearings every day, unfortunately they were not available until this morning, when they were sent in from the Government Printing Office. The Bureau of Fisheries presented at the hearings a statement showing the way in which this money will be expended. That break-down will appear in the hearings.

For eradication and investigation of the leech in the waters of Florida and Alabama: Control—dredging, \$150,000; replanting, \$85,000; scientific investigation and direction, \$15,000. Then for the starfish control, \$110,000; scientific investigation and direction, \$16,700. For control of the borer, \$90,000; scientific investigation and direction, \$10,600. Then for study and prevention of mortality of oysters from other causes in Louisiana, \$15,000; supervision, \$6,100.

The matter is fully covered.

I had just about reached the point when I was on the floor before of discussing the remedy for this pest. Since I left the floor I have been asked what the remedy would be.

First, in the Florida waters the evidence shows that the 800 acres that are now totally destroyed constitute a breeding ground from which this parasite emanates, and from which it may spread from the Florida waters up and down the coast. Now, to remedy this condition it will be necessary, where the oysters have been entirely destroyed, to remove the shells and grind them into lime, or otherwise dispose of them. Where they have been partly destroyed the remedy is to take the oysters up and carry them into fresh water, because the salinity of the waters seems to increase this pest very materially. It was recognized in 1906, reappeared in 1916, and appeared again in 1932.

As to the starfish, which plants itself on the outside of the oyster, there are two remedies that present themselves now. One is the taking up of the oyster and removal of the starfish and throwing the oyster back into the water. The other is by the use of a mesh which is dragged over the bottom with a tangle web which catches in the starfish and removes it from the body of the oyster. Of course, it is hoped that by scientific investigation and study of these problems further and speedier remedies may be found. As to the screw borer or drill, it is a marine snail that appears on the shell of the oyster. It can be removed by throwing the oyster against a screen made with a mesh sufficiently small to catch the oyster, throwing it to one side. The borers, which are smaller, pass through the mesh, and they

are collected in that way. Another remedy is by means of wire bags which are suspended over the oyster beds. By "bag" I mean a trap made of chicken wire or mesh.

One of them was brought before the committee. It had been used in the State of New Jersey. The borers on rising collect in these traps and gather with the shells or oysters in the trap. On the removal of the bag from the water the borers can be shaken out. One of the bags or traps presented before the committee had a large number of these borers on the inside of the wire mesh. This situation is vastly different from that which exists with the corn borer. We are dealing with a thing on the outside; something that can be discovered and something that can be detected. Permit me to add also that 80 percent of this work which is done in the eradication of these pests will go to people who are now out of employment, the very people who are suffering from these pests that are spreading along our coast. From 80 to 86 percent of this work, according to the testimony before the committee, will go to those people.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not have a copy of the committee report. Is this bill endorsed by the Bureau of Fisheries?

Mr. BLAND. Absolutely. Dr. Jackson, Dr. Galtsoff, and Dr. Prytherch, and several other representatives of the Bureau of Fisheries, appeared before the committee.

Mr. TRUAX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. TRUAX. The gentleman will admit that any attempts to eradicate these pests must be with pests that live and exist under water?

Mr. BLAND. That is true.

Mr. TRUAX. Then how can the gentleman ever be sure that the pest has been completely exterminated? If we allow only one of the parasites to remain there, there will be propagation.

Mr. BLAND. We fight human diseases. We fight spinal meningitis and we fight smallpox and everything else, never with the assurance that even in those cases of final eradication, but at least with the hope that we may get the malady under control. Then the States can carry out the remedies that shall be discovered by the Bureau of Fisheries, and complete the work of control or complete eradication.

Mr. TRUAX. We had great hopes of final eradication of the corn borer and tuberculosis in cattle and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease. The gentleman, in my judgment, has failed to prove his case justifying this vast expenditure for plans that are as yet unworkable and unknown.

Mr. BLAND. I hope the House does not agree with my distinguished friend from Ohio.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. May I observe that the gentleman from Ohio is speaking of the corn borer which is a pedestrian. The borer which the distinguished gentleman from Virginia speaks of is a swimmer.

Mr. BLAND. The corn borer is a great deal more concealed than the screw borer or drill. It is more concealed than any of these seafood pests except the wafer or leech.

Mr. CULKIN. One is a swimmer and the other is a pedestrian. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX] does not seem to know that.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I have made numerous inquiries in Ohio of those who were on guard watching out for the corn borer, and I have never yet seen anybody in Ohio who has ever seen a corn borer.

Mr. BLAND. We can produce samples of these pests and let you see them. In those bags that were presented to the committee I could show the gentleman how the screw borer or drill had been caught in those webs. They were presented to the committee.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I think that is one very good reason which the gentleman has stated in favor of his proposition, but I should like to ask the gentleman another question. Who furnished this break-down of figures?

Mr. BLAND. The Bureau of Fisheries.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I am with the gentleman and have been all along. Is not this business just as important to these people as the farms are to the farmers of the United States?

Mr. BLAND. Yes. It means everything in the world to them. It means far more than that. It means the preservation for this country of one of the greatest industries it has. Our fishermen have furnished men who have gone into the Navy of the United States and fought its battles in every war in which we have been engaged. Whenever this country has been at war and men for the Navy have been needed, it has been to the water that we have turned for our sailors. I ask that you vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the bill pass?

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds had voted in favor thereof.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 315, nays 38, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—315

Amle	Cravens	Hancock, N. Y.	McGroarty
Andresen	Crosby	Hancock, N. C.	McLaughlin
Andrew, Mass.	Cross, Tex.	Harlan	McLean
Andrews, N. Y.	Crosser, Ohio	Harter	McMillan
Arnold	Crowe	Hennings	McReynolds
Ashbrook	Culkin	Hess	McSwain
Bacharach	Cullen	Higgins, Conn.	Maas
Bacon	Cummings	Higgins, Mass.	Mahon
Barden	Darden	Hildebrandt	Maloney
Beiter	Darrow	Hill, Ala.	Mansfield
Bell	Deen	Hill, Knute	Mapes
Blackney	Delaney	Hill, Samuel B.	Marcantonio
Bland	Dempsey	Hobbs	Martin, Colo.
Blanton	Dies	Hollister	Martin, Mass.
Bloom	Dietrich	Holmes	Massingale
Boehne	Dingell	Hook	Maverick
Boileau	Ditter	Houston	May
Bolton	Dobbins	Huddleston	Meeks
Boylan	Dockweiler	Hull	Merritt, Conn.
Brennan	Dondero	Igoe	Merritt, N. Y.
Brooks	Dorsey	Imhoff	Michener
Brown, Ga.	Doughton	Jacobsen	Millard
Brown, Mich.	Doutrich	Jenckes, Ind.	Mitchell, Ill.
Brunner	Drewry	Jenkins, Ohio	Monaghan
Buchanan	Driscoll	Johnson, Tex.	Montet
Buck	Driver	Johnson, W. Va.	Moran
Buckler, Minn.	Duncan	Kahn	Mott
Bulwinkle	Dunn, Miss.	Kee	Murdock
Burch	Dunn, Pa.	Keller	Nelson
Burnham	Eagle	Kenney	Norton
Caldwell	Eaton	Kerr	O'Brien
Cannon, Mo.	Eckert	Kimball	O'Connell
Cannon, Wis.	Edmiston	Kleberg	O'Connor
Carden	Ekwall	Knutson	O'Leary
Carlson	Englebright	Kocalkowski	Oliver
Carmichael	Faddis	Kopplemann	O'Malley
Carter	Farley	Kramer	O'Neal
Cartwright	Fenerty	Kvale	Owen
Cary	Ferguson	Lambertson	Palmisano
Casey	Fernandez	Lambeth	Parks
Castellow	Fiesinger	Lamneck	Parsons
Cavichia	Fish	Larrabee	Patman
Chapman	Fitzpatrick	Lea, Calif.	Patton
Christianson	Flannagan	Leibach	Perkins
Citron	Ford, Calif.	Lemke	Peterson, Fla.
Clalborne	Fuller	Lesinski	Peterson, Ga.
Cochran	Gasque	Lewis, Colo.	Pettengill
Coffee	Gearhart	Lewis, Md.	Peyser
Colden	Gehrmann	Lloyd	Pfeifer
Cole, Md.	Gifford	Lord	Pierce
Cole, N. Y.	Gilchrist	Lucas	Pittenger
Colmer	Gillette	Lundeen	Plumley
Connery	Gingery	McAndrews	Powers
Cooley	Goodwin	McClellan	Quinn
Cooper, Tenn.	Greenwood	McCormack	Rabaut
Corning	Greever	McFarlane	Ramsay
Costello	Gregory	McGehee	Ramspeck
Cox	Gwynne	McGrath	Randolph

Rankin	Schulte	Taylor, Colo.	Wearin
Ransley	Scott	Taylor, S. C.	Weaver
Rayburn	Scrugham	Terry	Welch
Reece	Sears	Thom	Werner
Reed, N. Y.	Seger	Thomas	West
Reilly	Shanley	Thomason	Wheelchel
Rich	Shannon	Thompson	White
Richards	Sisson	Thurston	Whittington
Richardson	Smith, Conn.	Tinkham	Wigglesworth
Robertson	Smith, Va.	Tobey	Williams
Robinson, Utah	Smith, Wash.	Tolan	Wilson, La.
Rogers, Mass.	Snell	Tonry	Wilson, Pa.
Rogers, N. H.	South	Treadway	Withrow
Romjue	Stack	Turner	Wolcott
Rudd	Starnes	Turpin	Wolverton
Ryan	Steagall	Umstead	Wood
Sadowski	Stefan	Utterback	Woodruff
Sanders, La.	Stubbs	Vinson, Ky.	Woodrum
Sanders, Tex.	Sumners, Tex.	Wallgren	Zimmerman
Sandlin	Sutphin	Walter	Zioncheck
Sauthoff	Tarver	Warren	

NAYS—38

Allen	Eicher	Kniffin	Rogers, Okla.
Arends	Engel	Luckey	Secret
Ayers	Fletcher	Ludlow	Short
Beam	Focht	McLeod	Sweeney
Binderup	Gassaway	Mitchell, Tenn.	Taber
Carpenter	Gray, Pa.	Nichols	Taylor, Tenn.
Church	Hoepfel	Patterson	Truax
Collins	Hoffman	Polk	Wolfenden
Crawford	Johnson, Okla.	Reed, Ill.	
Duffey, Ohio	Kloeb	Robson, Ky.	

NOT VOTING—78

Adair	Disney	Hart	Pearson
Bankhead	Doxey	Hartley	Russell
Berlin	Duffy, N. Y.	Healey	Sabath
Biermann	Ellenbogen	Hope	Schaefer
Boland	Evans	Jones	Schneider
Brewster	Ford, Miss.	Kelly	Schuetz
Buckbee	Frey	Kennedy, Md.	Sirovich
Buckley, N. Y.	Fulmer	Kennedy, N. Y.	Smith, W. Va.
Burdick	Gambrill	Kinzer	Snyder
Celler	Gavagan	Lanham	Somers, N. Y.
Chandler	Gildea	Lee, Okla.	Spence
Clark, Idaho	Goldsborough	McDuffie	Stewart
Clark, N. C.	Granfield	McKeough	Sullivan
Cooper, Ohio	Gray, Ind.	Marshall	Underwood
Crowther	Green	Mason	Vinson, Ga.
Daly	Greenway	Mead	Wadsworth
Dear	Griswold	Miller	Wilcox
DeRouen	Guyer	Montague	Young
Dickstein	Haines	Moritz	
Dirksen	Hamlin	O'Day	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Mead with Mr. Wadsworth.
 Mr. Lanham with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
 Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Crowther.
 Mr. Schaefer with Mr. Brewster.
 Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Granfield with Mr. Guyer.
 Mr. Montague with Mr. Dirksen.
 Mr. Sabath with Mr. Marshall.
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Stewart.
 Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Hartley.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Buckbee.
 Mr. Disney with Mr. Hope.
 Mr. Jones with Mr. Burdick.
 Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Kinzer.
 Mr. Doxey with Mr. Schneider.
 Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Young.
 Mr. Underwood with Mr. Russell.
 Mr. Spence with Mrs. O'Day.
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Mason.
 Mr. Miller with Mr. McKeough.
 Mr. McDuffie with Mr. Healey.
 Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Sirovich.
 Mr. Green with Mr. Pearson.
 Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Wilcox.
 Mrs. Greenway with Mr. Haines.
 Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Ellenbogen.
 Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Berlin.
 Mr. Dear with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Buckley of New York.
 Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Gambrill.
 Mr. Griswold with Mr. Evans.
 Mr. Kelly with Mr. Hart.
 Mr. Biermann with Mr. Hamlin.
 Mr. Daly with Mr. Goldsborough.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR
 APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state

of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5255) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

Pending this motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue without limitation this afternoon, the time to be equally divided, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] and one-half by myself, if this is agreeable to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BACON. That will be entirely agreeable.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5255) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I received in the mail this morning a report from the Federal Power Commission on electric-power rates.

I have not had the opportunity of giving this extended study, but it appears that the information contained therein will be of extreme value to the American people.

Likewise, I should like to note here that this Commission, headed by Hon. Frank R. McNinch, has some of the ablest and most practical utility and power experts in the country. The selection of the personnel appears to be an excellent one. The following is the personnel:

Federal Power Commission: Frank R. McNinch, chairman; Basil Manly, vice chairman; Claude L. Draper, commissioner; Herbert J. Drane, commissioner; Clyde L. Seavey, commissioner.

Electric Rate Survey: Basil Manly, commissioner in charge; William E. Mosher, director; Arthur R. Wellwood, assistant director; Arthur M. Dunstan, supervisor reviewing section; Lester S. Ready, chief consulting engineer; Walter H. Dunlap, supervisor compiling section; Edward P. Roll, supervisor rate-checking section; M. M. Samuels, editorial division.

The report is sent to both Houses of Congress in response to a joint resolution submitted last year. It contains no conclusions of any kind but has a vast amount of factual data from which any reasonable person can draw conclusions.

The report shows two different classes of residential consumers, representing a study of 191 American cities. Ninety-three of these are cities of 100,000 or more population, and 98 of them are from fifty to one hundred thousand. They constitute approximately 49 percent of all residential consumers, both urban and rural, in the United States.

When this Commission was authorized to make this survey as of July 1, 1934, and secure from the utilities the various rates all over the country, the past 6 months have shown some 60, or approximately one-third, of the utilities in 191 cities have reduced their rates.

Well, gentlemen, there is only one reason:

They were charging too much and reduced their rates in fear of our Government.

But, to go on with the study of rates: It was found that there was no such thing as a uniform electric rate. The report shows to date, for only residential, there are some ten to twelve thousand different rate schedules. This is due:

First. To regulations, or lack of regulations, of the various State governmental bodies.

Second. To tradition, laziness, and a desire to "cover up."

Third. To what is called the "readiness to serve", which determines the capacity of the plant, the transmission and distribution system, and thus the investment of the company. It is the basis of the investment charges in which each and every customer properly shares.

Fourth. Character and density of the population, geographical conditions, accessibility to fuel or water power, and seasonal usage enter into the cost.

In their report they have a chart of the 191 cities mentioned, showing the cost of electricity for residential service. The lowest in the 25-kilowatt-hour classification is in Cleveland, Ohio, and the cost of this service is 88 cents, serviced by the Cleveland Department of Public Utilities, a municipal plant. The highest in that same classification is Miami, Fla., which is \$2.76, or more than three times as much. It is serviced by the Florida Power & Light Co., which is a subsidiary of a holding company. Note the difference in private and public ownership.

An illustration in another classification is at Tacoma, Wash., the price for this residential service would be \$6.40 for 500 kilowatt-hours. It is serviced by the Tacoma Department of Public Utilities, a municipal plant; and the highest in that same classification is Yonkers, N. Y., which is \$28.35, or about 4 times as much, and the service is supplied by the Yonkers Electric Light & Power Co., a subsidiary of a holding company.

Jacksonville, Fla., for instance, a municipally owned plant, has one of the highest rates and that is due to the fact that approximately 65 percent of the city budget is handled out of the utilities profits. Whatever the city needs for their budget they take. The tax rate is naturally lower than it should be, and utilities rates higher than they should be. Therefore, the only conclusion is that the Jacksonville utilities, paid for by all the people, are keeping up taxpayers, probably a disproportionate burden, no doubt giving relief mainly to big taxpayers. This appears to be a case where municipal ownership of utilities is being used for paying taxes.

An argument is made by private utilities that they pay taxes, but Jacksonville is an example of the utilities paying 65 percent of the city taxes.

The facts I state are official, but the conclusions mine. In this connection, I also desire to submit to you certain additional, plain, ordinary facts, submitted by the Department of Commerce (Bureau of the Census) in a booklet "Central Electric Light and Power Stations, 1932."

National average cost per kilowatt-hour in 1932 for domestic (residential) service: For municipal plants, 4.7 cents; for private plants, 5.6 cents. (Pp. 60 and 61, col. 6, bottom of page; also p. 66.)

For small light and power (commercial): Municipal-plant rate, 2.6 cents; private-plant rate, 4.3 cents. (Pp. 60 and 61, col. 4; also p. 68.)

Average charge for street lighting: Municipal-plant rate, 2.1 cents; private-plant rate, 4.7 cents. (See pp. 60 and 61.)

These are just facts, but everyone must conclude that it means what it says, that municipal ownership gives cheaper rates.

Every American by now knows the Power Trust, of its practices, the holding-company racket; and the only thing in the picture that looks good are the commissions that have been appointed by the Federal Government and nearly all of the States in order to regulate, investigate, and to compile factual data.

The Power Trust has heretofore shrewdly organized and, with able lawyers and propagandists and plenty of other people's money, have had their way until just recently. It cannot be denied that the Federal Trade Commission has slowed them down and that the Power Commission will now help in putting things straight.

If the Power Trust, or any part of it, cared to violate a State law or impose upon the people of a certain State, they would use a holding company. If they wished to get out of the way of the Federal Government, they used a cor-

poration incorporated under the laws of a certain State and operated wholly within that State. The private power industry has been nationally controlled, owned, and operated by private interests and by a few individuals, so why should not the people change this to operation either for or by the

public interests? Heretofore the utilities and power companies—and I particularly now refer to gas and electricity—have enjoyed undisputed monopoly with little or no regulation.

I desire here to insert a table of rates on page 19 of the report:

Minimum and maximum charges for typical amounts of electricity
CITIES OF 100,000 POPULATION AND OVER

Number of kilowatt-hours	Cities with lowest bills	Service supplied by—	Amount	Cities with highest bills	Service supplied by—	Amount	Percent difference
15	Cleveland, Ohio.....	Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.....	\$0.60	Miami, Fla.....	Florida Power & Light Co.....	\$1.71	185
	do.....	Cleveland Department of Public Utilities.....	.60				
25	Columbus, Ohio.....	Columbus Division of Electricity ¹60				
	Cleveland, Ohio.....	Cleveland Department of Public Utilities ¹88	do.....	do.....	2.76	213
40	do.....	do.....	1.31	do.....	do.....	4.18	219
100	Tacoma, Wash.....	Tacoma Department of Public Utilities.....	2.40	Jacksonville, Fla.....	Jacksonville Municipal Plant ¹	7.00	192
250	do.....	do.....	3.90	Yonkers, N. Y.....	Yonkers Electric Light & Power Co.....	15.85	306
500	do.....	do.....	6.40	do.....	do.....	28.35	343

CITIES OF 50,000 TO 100,000 POPULATION

15	Cleveland Heights, Ohio.....	Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.....	\$0.60	York, Pa.....	Edison Light & Power Co.....	\$1.66	176
	Holyoke, Mass.....	Holyoke Gas and Electric Department ¹60				
	Lakewood, Ohio.....	Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.....	.60	New Rochelle, N. Y.....	Westchester Lighting Co.....	2.36	168
	do.....	Cleveland Department of Public Utilities ¹60	Mount Vernon, N. Y.....	do.....	2.36	168
25	do.....	do.....	.88	Atlantic City, N. J.....	Atlantic City Electric Co.....	3.60	175
40	do.....	do.....	1.31	New Rochelle, N. Y.....	Westchester Lighting Co.....	7.31	168
100	Madison, Wis.....	Madison Gas & Electric Co.....	2.73	Mount Vernon, N. Y.....	do.....	7.31	168
250	Springfield, Ill.....	{City Water, Light, and Power Department ¹}	4.80	New Rochelle, N. Y.....	do.....	16.31	240
				Mount Vernon, N. Y.....	do.....	16.31	240
500	do.....	do.....	7.30	New Rochelle, N. Y.....	do.....	28.81	295
				Mount Vernon, N. Y.....	do.....	28.81	295

¹ Municipal plants.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. Does not the gentleman think that whereas holding companies place these power companies altogether out of the control of the States that we had better regulate them?

Mr. MAVERICK. I think we ought to abolish holding companies, of course; but I think a great deal better thing would be eventually to work into Government ownership of all public utilities. [Applause.]

I believe an important thing has come before us, something that is far more important than many of the things we have considered. Also there is not the slightest doubt on earth that the American people want public control at once of all utilities—power, transportation, communication, and otherwise—and prefer new organizations to be financed, owned, and operated by themselves rather than be hooked by private profiteers.

I do not believe in the immediate taking over of utilities, but I do believe in public regulation of private utilities and public ownership where it can be done without economic waste, and a gradual acquisition by the American people of their own public resources should be our policy.

Now, a great deal has been said by the Power Trust propagandists, that industrial power is obtained more cheaply through private companies than through municipal companies. It is only fair to admit this is true.

But this is largely due to the fact that the biggest power companies in the biggest industrial centers are privately owned and the industrial power users have paid rates which in some cases just about cover the cost of generating and transmitting the current they use, leaving the burden of profit and speculation to be carried by the domestic consumers.

My information is that the industrial power users pay an average cost to the municipally owned plants of 1.7 cents per kilowatt-hour, while that paid to the private utilities is 1.5 cents per kilowatt-hour. This is the heavy industries that use approximately 60 percent of the kilowatt-hours. That is

not a fair comparison, as there are only 1,990 municipally owned plants, and they are of the smaller type, only five plants being in cities over 250,000 population. Consequently, they do not have the chance to sell the large users. If they did have the chance to compete with large privately owned utilities, with this increased amount of volume, their cost would be substantially lower. Even with this handicap, the municipal plant sold for domestic service for residences cheaper than private utilities. Also, cities give many free services, have loans to pay off, and in many cases give free street lighting, do water pumping, and so on.

Now, it is not my desire to tell something that every child knows, and that is, we—I do not mean Congress, but all the people—are the Government. And every time I speak of the Government I mean the people of the United States.

And we must agree to certain facts, among these is that regulation is here forever, and the old idea of letting the boil burst is over. Also, with the acquisition of forests, the building of dams, the creation of such groups as the Tennessee Valley Authority, we can see that cooperative public ownership is here to stay.

Whether one is reactionary or liberal, all must agree that hundreds of millions have been stolen from the American people by crooked combines and dishonest propaganda; that the holding company helped in the process, and that the holding company must go.

And if we are not blind, we can certainly see the trend of the times. The trend is toward an industrial and agricultural democracy where there will be some fairer system of the distribution of wealth. [Applause.]

The Congress of the United States must consider the policy of whether we favor Government ownership or not. I do not say that we can go ahead and acquire these various utilities and power companies all at once.

However, I believe we are gradually getting to the point where we will have Government ownership—let me repeat, ownership by the people. If we do not, I believe everyone will admit we must have Government regulation. Take, for instance, the Tennessee Valley Authority, both as a shining

example of Government ownership and regulation by comparison, by sale of cheap power and the bringing down of rates. The T. V. A. is going to affect 6 or 7 States, and the idea is gradually going to spread all over the country.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. The other gentleman from Texas spoke about State regulation. Have we not had the experience of many instances where the utility boards in the States did not subscribe to the wishes of the people, and it is only since President Roosevelt started the Tennessee Valley proposition that we are getting any action at all on rates?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes; and a further step ahead was made with the Power Commission, when they started to investigate, and 60 utilities reduced their rates before the report was made.

Mr. CONNERY. That would favor the gentleman's idea that there should be Government ownership of all public utilities of the sort which directly affect the people?

Mr. MAVERICK. Many of the State bodies, I cannot say have proved corrupt but have certainly proved inattentive to the needs of the people; and it has become necessary, because of grave abuses, to enact national legislation, to create the Power Commission, and to put enough teeth in the law to protect the people. Of course people say that the Government should not be in business. I believe also that the Government should not compete with private business, but the competition of the Tennessee Valley Authority is public business and has pushed down rates to a reasonable level.

The Government of the United States is not concerned with speculative profits in any way. They do not have to make a good showing on Wall Street; so that the Government can go into the power business and conduct it without the necessity of advertising, promotion fees, the prostituting of our schools and colleges, and, again, speculative profits. When we have reasonable rates, this forces the private companies down to the same reasonable level; therefore, I say that this report, which is a preliminary report with many more to be issued, is for information for all the people, and is an excellent thing from an educational viewpoint. This is really constructive, and we should encourage things of this kind.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOYLAN. What has been the experience in the gentleman's own State with reference to the regulation of these public utilities?

Mr. MAVERICK. Sad, indeed. My State, from the standpoint of the regulation of utilities, is one of the worst in the United States because it has no utilities commission at all. I believe the States of Delaware and Texas are the only two States in the Union that have no utilities commission. We have a railroad commission, which attempts to control oil and the railroads, but that is not relevant here. They let the Power Trust alone.

Mr. BOYLAN. Does not the gentleman think that he ought to recommend that his own State do something?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes. I think there ought to be a lot of things done in Texas, but we have done so many other things right you will have to forgive us for doing one thing wrong. [Applause.]

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Boylan has asked you about your State utilities. What about your city?

Mr. MAVERICK. Now, do not get me into too much local politics. I can say to the gentleman, however, that we have a very large and efficient privately owned public utility, with one of the best managers in the United States. However, if anyone from my city should ask me, I would suggest that he inquire into the local rates and compare them with other rates shown in the report of the Federal Power Commission. Many of my people want municipal ownership, but that is up to them.

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LLOYD. When we were considering the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, it appeared that the private companies had paid practically nothing over a great many years upon the building of their plant. The gentleman spoke of the rate in Tacoma, Wash., as being the cheapest in the United States. I may offer the further suggestion that included in the rate is amortization of both plants so that they are practically paid for at the present time. That is, practically speaking, they do not owe a cent of indebtedness.

Mr. MAVERICK. I thank the gentleman very much for his observation. Your city has an enviable record, and I am glad to know the facts, and in connection with the fact that your municipality has practically paid off its obligations this, of course, has been through its profits. If that had been a privately owned utility, they would have taken the profits and paid them out on common stock, and that is the reason municipal ownership is the proper thing. In this connection may I say that the report of the Power Commission is a fair one, whereas most of the reports of privately owned utilities are unfair. They juggle figures; they have hundreds of different rates; they misrepresent the amount of taxes paid.

Gentlemen, the Power Commission is a regulatory body which will give us the facts—which will establish a yardstick—upon which we can form our conclusions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that every Member may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend his remarks in connection with general debate on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to direct the attention of the Members of the House, and particularly the attention of my colleagues from the South, to some matters which vitally affect the welfare of the southern cotton farmers and especially the small tenant farmers.

It is, unfortunately, very difficult to approach a discussion of any pending national problem with any hope of arousing interest in any procedure that is being followed for its solution by authorities of the administration without making some sort of attack upon those who are trying to solve that problem. In other words, so long as a Member of Congress is willing to concede that those administrative authorities who are dealing with the problem are sincere and able, the disposition on the part of his listeners, if he undertakes to discuss that problem, is to say, "Well, if that is true, let them work it out. There is no need of interference by Congress."

I wish to discuss a problem today in which I feel that Congress should concern itself, and at the same time to announce my confidence in both the ability and sincerity of those departmental authorities who are trying to solve it. It is a problem the burden for whose solution properly rests on Congress and cannot be properly transferred to any administrative authority, however sincere and able that authority may be. I refer to necessary changes in procedure under the Bankhead Act.

Probably no legislation ever enacted by Congress has occasioned in its administration more bitter complaint. Going, as it did, into an entirely new field, it was to be expected that it would be found inadequate in many particulars, and that in its administration thousands of mistakes would be made. However, it was also to be expected that as mistakes were demonstrated, they would be corrected. If administrative mistakes, they should be corrected by the Department of Agriculture. If legislative mistakes, they should be corrected by Congress. My purpose today is to insist upon Congress to take action to correct demonstrated legislative mistakes in that measure and also to insure, by proper legislation, the correction of administrative errors.

Those of us who come from the South will recall the innumerable complaints of farmers against certain features of the Bankhead Act and its administration during the recent marketing season. The dissatisfaction of a large, if not a major, portion of our cotton farmers became so acute, with the balloting on the act to determine whether it should be continued in the offing, that it was deemed necessary that vigorous steps be taken to prevent an adverse vote. Assurances issued from the Secretary of Agriculture and on down through other officials of the administration of that Department, and particularly through the county agents who were in close contact with the farmers, that adequate steps would be taken to correct injustices that had been demonstrated. The President himself issued a statement shortly before the election on the Bankhead Act, indicating that legislation would be enacted to provide for an exemption of 2 bales in cases where the 5-year base average was 2 bales or less, but that statement was unfortunately not explicit in stating whether the exemption should be to the farmer with such an average or to the farm. Through all of these efforts, however, most farmers who had complaints became impressed with the belief that amendatory legislation would be passed taking care of their particular situation. It was largely on account of this feeling that the cotton farmer voted for a continuance of the Bankhead Act by a vote of around 9 to 1.

What were some of the complaints that had arisen? It is impossible to detail them all, but Congressmen from the South are familiar with them. Secretary Wallace noted one of them when he issued a statement in which he said that some sort of appellate procedure should be provided from the apportionments made by county committees. County committees are not infallible. Undoubtedly, the great majority of them acted with the most intense desire to be just and do a hard job well. And yet mistakes were necessarily made. Dependent largely upon what each farmer reported himself for their information as to his average production, they were deceived by some who got more than their share, to the injury of others who had honestly reported their yield and who, when an entire county's allotments as made by the county committee had to be cut in order to keep within that county's total allotment, which would not have been necessary if all farmers had made honest reports, had their allotments cut by a certain fixed percentage, applicable to all alike. Thus the honest men suffered and the rascal benefited. Also, some county committeemen did not have the high regard for their duties that most of them did.

I have had called to my attention instances in which county committeemen were guilty of partiality toward themselves, their relatives, their close friends. Whenever they gave any person a greater allotment than he was entitled to receive, they necessarily took away from some other person who was entitled to it part of what was his. And necessarily, where discriminations did occur, where county committeemen were unfair, the ones who benefited by their unfairness were the prominent, the influential, and the strong, and those who suffered were the poor and the weak. When, in exceptional cases, a county committeeman was of this type, he followed literally the scriptural injunction, that "unto every one that hath shall be given, * * * but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath."

I have said that in a program of this magnitude mistakes were necessarily made. We all expected them to be made; but we also expected them to be corrected when it was shown that they had been made. We did not expect, for example, that when a county committeeman rented—as in one instance about which I have been informed—a few acres of a 320-acre farm and gave to himself an allotment for those few acres greater than he accorded the operator of the entire remainder of the farm, there would be no way in which such an injustice could be corrected; and that when complaint was made, the complainant would be merely told that he must go back to his county committee, and that from no other source could he obtain redress. When the marketing season began and complaints of this character came pouring in to me, I took up with the Secretary of Agriculture, and

with the chairman of the State allotment board in Georgia, the question of some appellate procedure by which manifest errors when clearly shown might be corrected. I was assured that the State allotment board would have control of such procedure. The chairman of the State allotment board called me on the long-distance phone and advised me to send these complaints to him. I sent him many hundreds in which the errors claimed were clearly pointed out. I believe that our Georgia chairman wanted to do what he could to correct these injustices; but finally, under departmental instruction, it narrowed down simply to writing the complainant a consoling letter and informing him that the action of the county committee was final. In other words, no appellate procedure was provided. I understand the department now claims it has authority to provide for consideration of appeals from the decisions of county committees without additional legislation. If so, it had that authority last year and did not exercise it.

However much in good faith the Department may be, we cannot, with full knowledge of what was done last year, discharge our duties to those farmers who did not get fair treatment unless we amend the Bankhead Act and provide for some procedure by which, when an injustice is done a farmer, he may have the right of review. In my State a man cannot have a judgment for \$5 rendered against him in a justice court without having the right to carry his case by appropriate procedure from the justice court to the superior court and from the superior court to the court of appeals itself. Is it fair that where, by an unjust decision of a county committee, he is rendered liable for the payment, in order to market his cotton, of a large amount in taxes or compelled to purchase at \$20 a bale certificates of exemption from others, he should not have the privilege of having his case reviewed by any authority anywhere? Perhaps his complaint is not well founded, but do you southern Congressmen not know that in many cases great injustices were done, which, under the procedure established, nobody had the power to correct unless the authority making the error, the county committee, would voluntarily correct it?

There are many hardships brought about under the law. A tenant living in 1933 on a farm where he produced 10 or 12 bales of cotton may have moved—as thousands of tenants move every year—to a farm with a 5-year base average of two or three bales, which even then may have had to be shared with other tenants. Perhaps he had a large family, trained only in raising cotton. By the necessary reduction in his allotment under the Bankhead Act, such tenants in many instances last year were brought to the verge of destitution. Congress should at least consider amending the law so as to provide for some consideration for the man as well as the farm.

Whether the Bankhead Act will be perpetuated and will accomplish its purposes is yet to be determined. It is at least a highly debatable question. I offered some observations regarding the wisdom of the act when it was passed through this House, and I am not yet convinced that a policy of rigid crop reduction is best calculated to help our farmers. However, they have indicated their desire that it be continued for this year, and I certainly feel that it is a matter as to which the wishes of the farmers themselves should control. But when they expressed their wishes, they were relying upon assurances that had been given that the law would be materially changed. One thing that ought to be remedied is the practice of a minority of our farmers in dealing unfairly with tenants. A vast majority of the cotton farmers have not only not been unfair but have been cooperating with the administration in every possible way to make its policies successful.

But occasionally we have the man who will do things like this: Landlord A calls in tenant B in the fall of 1934 and says: "Well, Bill, you've been with me for 10 years and I have been mighty well satisfied with you as a tenant; but under the Bankhead Act, I will only be allowed to raise 10 bales of cotton on this farm. I can raise that much with my own force, and if I need a little help at times I can hire it. So, Bill, I cannot rent to you for 1935." And when Bill

went out looking for land to rent elsewhere he could not find any. Now, there are thousands of "Bills" in the South today who have been evicted from their occupation of a lifetime through no fault of their own, and have nowhere to go and no way to make a livelihood for themselves and their families. Are we going to try to do anything for them? Are we willing to amend the Bankhead Act and give a little more consideration to the man instead of all consideration to the land?

Now, the purpose of these remarks is simply this: Every farmer in the South expected the Bankhead Act to be amended by this Congress. They were assured that it would be before they ever voted on it in December of last year. For more than a month I have been continually urging the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to begin hearings on a bill to amend the act. We all know that the cotton farmer must know as soon as possible just what he is going to be allowed to do for 1935. He cannot wait until planting time for that information. He must be able to properly pitch his crop and make his plans. Within the last few days information has reached me that the Secretary of Agriculture does not want Congress to amend the law. He takes the position that the Department can make any necessary changes by regulation. The Department of Agriculture cannot change the law. If it could or should undertake to do so, this Congress is not justified in shunting its duties over to the Department of Agriculture. The constituents of Southern Congressmen are expecting them to make necessary changes in the Bankhead Act. You, my brethren from the South, cannot afford to go home and tell your farmers that the Department of Agriculture wanted to do that for you, and you decided to let them have the responsibility. The responsibility is yours. It may be a tough job, but you not only ought to undertake it, but you ought to do it without further delay. Let us all urge the Committee on Agriculture to immediately begin hearings in this matter. Do we want to wait as last year until the last of April before we let the farmer know what to expect?

The small cotton farmer, the tenant farmer, has suffered in the administration of the Bankhead Act. We all know it; and while he may not be influential, and may not in some instances even be able to pay his taxes so as to qualify himself to vote, we are not discharging our duty if we leave his salvation to the Department of Agriculture, and fail to see that the promises, express and implied, that were made to him before he voted on the Bankhead Act are observed.

Even high authorities in the administration of the Bankhead Act realize the injustices that have come about in its enforcement. I have not even attempted to discuss them all.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I ask unanimous consent that I may include in my remarks a letter written by the chairman of the State allotment board of Georgia, outlining defects in the administration of the Bankhead Act and suggesting remedies for those defects.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Athens, Ga., December 15, 1934.

Hon. M. C. TARVER,
Member of Congress,
Dalton, Ga.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TARVER: As chairman of the State board of review in connection with the voluntary-control plan, and chairman of the State allotment board in connection with the administration of the Bankhead Act in Georgia, I have the following observations and suggestions to make with reference to future programs. Knowing that you are interested in working out the most satisfactory plan, I am making these observations and suggestions with the hope that they will be of help in the working out of a more satisfactory plan for 1935.

One of the suggestions I have made is, of course, that already named by the President, and I think this most vital.

1. Consideration should be given both the man and the land in arriving at a basis for contract or cotton allotment under the Bankhead Act. I would suggest 50 percent consideration for the land and 50 percent consideration for the man. This would iron out a great many of the difficulties and troubles that we now

have. The present program calls for consideration only on the land in arriving at a basis for contract or cotton allotment.

2. I think a minimum allotment should be allowed a small farmer, which interpretation should include large farm acreages with small cotton-producing units. Each farmer or producing unit should be allowed at least two bales to be ginned tax free. It is not enough to say that at least 2 bales should be allowed per farm as a minimum, since there may be on a farm as many as 20 farm units, in which case a minimum of 2 bales would mean nothing.

3. There are evidences of county allotments being too small and other county allotments too large. A recheck and revision should be made by the Bureau of Crop Estimates to correct these evident errors in allotments. This, likewise, would go a long way toward helping out in such counties where injustices have been done because of incorrect county allotments.

4. The selection of community and county committees for future programs should be made by the farmers prior to the handling of any future contracts or allotments under a compulsory allotment plan, such as the Bankhead Act. The county committees and community committees that have served in the past programs had to be hurriedly selected, and this was done by a relatively small number of farmers within a county. There should be given a larger preference for the selection of these committeemen.

5. The committeemen who serve should be those whose principal, if not entire, income should be from farming. Such as the following should not be permitted to serve as committeemen: Political officeholders or those who have offered for political office within the past 2 years; ginners; warehousemen; cotton buyers; bankers lending money to farmers; supply merchants; and fertilizer salesmen. Many men under the above classifications have served as committeemen without fear or favor, but it has been a source of criticism and questioning among farmers that has been hurtful to the program and should be avoided in the future.

6. No tax-exemption certificates should be allowed to be sold by a producer unless such producer can show to the satisfaction of the county committee that he had a crop failure during the current year and is entitled to the tax exemption as crop insurance. The fact that many producers received tax-exemption certificates in excess of the requirements for marketing their crop was not understood by other producers who had to buy, and it was a source of great dissatisfaction to the producers in general.

7. I am convinced that for at least the year 1935 we need a compulsory program, along with the voluntary, in order that the object sought in adjusting surplus may be achieved in the shortest time and the most equitable way to all cotton producers concerned, for if we do not have the compulsory plan it will take longer to adjust this surplus, and the burden of accomplishing it will be borne by the big-hearted and generous farmers, while the selfish will receive returns which they have not had any part in making possible.

Trusting that these suggestions along with the many others that you have received will be of help to you in arriving at a just and equitable program, I am,

Respectfully yours,

G. V. CUNNINGHAM,
Chairman State Allotment Board and
Chairman State Board of Review, State of Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. No administration in history has ever made more earnest and sincere efforts to help the farmer than the one now in power. I conclude, as I began, with a tribute to the sincerity and ability of those dealing with the problem; but I also conclude with the insistence that we are part of this administration and that to fail to deal with that portion of its problems properly coming within the sphere of our duties is either a confession of incompetency or a breach of trust.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. From the gentleman's remarks I can see he has made quite a study of this matter. I should like to ask the gentleman whether or not in his opinion it would be advisable to amend the Bankhead law so as to make the base of crop control an acreage base rather than a lint-pound base?

Mr. TARVER. Suggestions have been made along that line which, in my opinion, ought to be carefully studied. The chairman of the State allotment board of my State suggests that in future apportionments 50 percent of the farmer's allotment ought to be allocated according to the 5-year base-production average of the farm in accordance with existing law and 50 percent in accordance with the 5-year base-production average of the man himself. In other words, that one-half of the allocation ought to be allocated according to the previous production of the farmer himself, and one-half according to the previous production of the farm on which he is located. All those matters should receive the consideration of the Committee on

Agriculture, but I am concerned over the fact that, despite the promises which were made to our farmers last fall, no steps are being taken, although we have been here more than 30 days, to work out the necessary amendments to the law.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. The Committee on Agriculture did give thorough consideration to that subject last year, including the question of the limitation of acreage, and it was decided upon the overwhelming opinion of experts that if we limited merely the acreage the cotton farmers could almost double and in some cases more than double their production on the same land in acreage, which would defeat the entire purpose of the bill; so it was necessary to give a great deal of attention and consideration to the average production of the individual farmer.

Mr. TARVER. Let me suggest to my colleague that when the Committee on Agriculture was giving consideration to this problem last year they did not have the benefit of the experience in the enforcement of the Bankhead Act, which has since come about. They were dealing with a matter which had never been tried in the history of the country, and they certainly ought to be willing to give consideration to the entire subject matter in the light of the experiences, some of them rather harrowing, that have come about in the efforts to bring about enforcement of the law in an impartial way.

Mr. BOILEAU. I agree with the gentleman in that respect.

Mr. TARVER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman feel that the tying of the quota to the ownership of the land encourages racketeering and manipulation against the share-cropper and the farm tenant?

Mr. TARVER. It has undoubtedly resulted in very serious injury to the tenant population of the South.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. There is a minority of our farmers—not, I am glad to say, anything approaching a majority, but a minority—who are owners of land and who are trying to take the selfish view that they ought to act entirely in their own interest and without regard to those who have been tenants on their lands, and there is a disposition on the part of this minority to turn their tenants loose on the world without any home, without any land to cultivate, and to reserve for themselves and their hired labor the privilege of cultivating and marketing such cotton as may be allocated to their particular farms.

In order to do justice to this class of our people, the allocation ought not to be entirely to the farm; at least, a portion of it, in my judgment, ought to be allocated to the farmer without regard to the question of his ownership of land.

Mr. CRAWFORD. From the gentleman's study of this question as applied to cotton, does he feel that the same conditions will likely prevail in all other crops to which compulsory control is applied?

Mr. TARVER. I have given no study to the problem insofar as it involves the production of other crops. My interest in the matter has actually been somewhat limited to my concern over the future of the cotton farmer. I would not feel qualified to answer the gentleman's question intelligently as to tobacco, for example, of which very little is produced in my district.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman think the same principle would likely apply as between landowners in other parts of the country?

Mr. TARVER. It occurs to me that might be very probable.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman know of any cases in the South where what you might call speculative lessees have rented lands and then stepped up these lands and

rented to others and then to others and then to others, with no thought of working the lands, but simply to gather unto themselves the benefits that might flow; in other words, dealing in leases rather than the actual operation of the land?

Mr. TARVER. No; I will say to my colleague that I have not had my attention called to any cases of that particular character.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When the gentleman spoke of the \$20 per bale benefit payment that some tenants are having to make—

Mr. TARVER. Where the tenant or any other cotton farmer produces cotton in excess of the amount allocated to him and desires to market it, he must either pay the tax which is levied by the Bankhead Act or must purchase from some farmer who has certificates allocated to him in excess of his production the certificates necessary for his cotton in order to authorize its marketing; and these certificates were sold, under restrictions fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture during the last season, at 4 cents per pound, or \$20 per bale.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If cotton should advance to 18 or 20 cents per pound, would that certificate value likely go up?

Mr. TARVER. The certificate value, as I have stated, was fixed, and is authorized to be fixed under the terms of the act, by the Secretary of Agriculture. He might fix it at 4 cents a pound or at any other price which would appeal to him as being fair and just.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CASTELLOW. What is the gentleman's opinion as to the probability of securing legislation which would remedy the evils of which complaint has been, and is being, made?

Mr. TARVER. I cannot conceive that there is any possibility that we shall not carry out the promises which were made by county agents all over the South and by other authorities in the Department of Agriculture to the farmers that amendatory legislation would be enacted by the Congress. Except for the promise of the President with regard to the two-bale exemption, I know of no specific promise that has been made, but certainly the propaganda which was circulated was of such a character as to impress every farmer dissatisfied with the administration of the Bankhead Act with the idea that legislation would be enacted which would take care of his particular case; and in view of these representations made to practically all of the farmers in the South before they voted to continue the Bankhead Act, it is inconceivable to me that Congress should now adopt the attitude of saying that we will not consider any amendatory legislation at all, but will undertake to transfer this burden of bringing about corrections in the Bankhead Act to the Department of Agriculture. I think it would be a breach of faith. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration H. R. 5255, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, the following leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. LUCAS, indefinitely, on account of death in family;

To Mr. LANHAM, for today, on account of illness;

To Mr. MORITZ (at the request of Mr. HAINES), for 3 days, on account of the serious illness of his father;

To Mr. CAVICCHIA, for 1 week, on account of death in his family;

To Mr. MEAD, for several days, on account of attending a funeral; and

To Mr. BEITER, for several days, on account of attending a funeral.

ACTION NECESSARY ON TOWNSEND OLD-AGE REVOLVING PENSION PLAN

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Speaker, there are few persons who will question the statement that unemployment relief and old-age security indisputably are woven together, and it is my opinion that when we locate the solution to one of these problems we also will have discovered the solution to the other.

I dare say that every patriotic legislator in the Nation today is deeply concerned over the best method of obtaining relief from unemployment and eliminating the fear of poverty among those citizens past the age of industrial usefulness. I agree with the philosophy which refuses to accept an army of unemployed and insecure old age as necessary evils of our future. It is my opinion that we will solve the problem in a practical fashion. To do this, however, means the cooperation of every citizen. As legislators it is our particular duty to inspect every plan that comes before us with care and diligence, and treat every proposal with the same courtesy, study, and consideration that we might give to one of our own.

You will agree with me, I am confident, when I state that the suggested solution known as the "Townsend old-age revolving pension plan" is the foremost proposal of its kind before us today. It is an unusual plan, even its most avowed advocate will grant, because of its extraordinary features. The operation of this plan would involve the collection and the expenditure of a stupendous sum of money.

The fundamental truth, however, is that the size of the sum involved does not matter if the plan is fair and workable.

It will be the duty of the Members of Congress to determine if this plan is an equitable and a workable one so I bring it to your attention today, because you have shown your faith in my honesty and sincerity many times and in many ways, and I feel that it is my duty to you and to my people back home to discuss the matter briefly.

This program, known sometimes as the "revolving pension plan", is remarkable for its simplicity. It would provide \$200 monthly for every person over the age of 60 years who is a citizen of this country and who does not have a record of having participated in a major crime. The money with which to operate the plan would be raised by a tax on business transactions.

According to William L. Austin, Director of the United States Bureau of the Census, there are 10,385,026 persons in this country who are 60 years of age and over. Of this number, of course, there are thousands who would not apply for a pension, and additional thousands who would not be eligible because of a criminal record and indefinite proof of citizenship. The total over 60 years of age includes 6,633,905 who are over 65 years of age, 3,863,200 who are over 70 years of age, and 1,913,196 persons who are over 75 years of age. Federal figures show that year by year the total number of persons over the age of 60 years is increasing numerically and in ratio to the total population. For instance, in 1890 persons over the age of 60 constituted 6.2 percent of the population. The percentage was boosted to 6.4 percent in 1900, to 6.8 percent in 1910, to 7.5 percent in 1920, and in 1930 persons over 60 years of age represented 8.5 percent of our total population.

In other words, gentlemen, our present-day problem of old-age security has been creeping upon us for at least 40 years to our own definite knowledge, and we failed to realize our danger. In addition it is very easy to note that we can anticipate a larger number of persons over 60 years of age, and that as a consequence our problem will be increased as time progresses rather than alleviated. That is, the problem will increase unless we act quickly. The crisis is here. We need drastic action.

There are those who laugh at the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan. I cannot agree with their doubtful sense of humor—a sense of humor which strikes terror into the hearts of 10,386,026 old persons. I particularly disagree with anyone who laughs at a proposal before studying it from every conceivable angle. Only the well-informed should question anyone or anything. Few persons have taken the trouble to study this proposal before registering an opinion. Those who laugh are not laughing at a legislative movement; they are laughing at 20,000,000 persons who are active supporters of this plan.

This old-age security plan is no laughing matter for the old folks over 60 years of age. Statistics show that most persons over that age—I believe the figure is 4 out of 5—are dependent upon others for their very existence. Of all persons who cherish independence and deserve independence it is the older person who has been cast aside by our machine age.

This revolving pension plan has been placed before Congress in the form of a bill, H. R. 3977, and is sponsored by the Honorable JOHN STEVEN MCGROARTY, a distinguished citizen, a man of sterling honesty and integrity, and a man whom I am proud to call my friend, my colleague, and my fellow Californian.

I have just returned from a meeting of the Ways and Means Committee, where Dr. Townsend, the originator of this plan, is testifying. He and the committee are straightening out many controversial points in the bill, dealing with the method of taxation, the delegation of authority, the manner of distributing the pension money, penalties for falsification, and other matters concerning the general workability of the bill. It is a fundamental principle of democracy that legislators should be given the opportunity to act on legislation, particularly if a large proportion of the citizenry favors the proposed legislation, and I hope that the 20,000,000 people who are interested in this bill will not be disappointed. I sincerely trust that Dr. Townsend and his associates will be able to convince the Ways and Means Committee that the bill is meritorious in order that it may be reported out of committee and thus give the Members of the House of Representatives an opportunity to act on the measure.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE HOUSE

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] and I have promised several Members time who did not find it convenient to speak this afternoon. For that reason the Committee rose earlier than it otherwise would. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow. The day will be devoted to general debate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think that is necessary?

Mr. OLIVER. Tomorrow will be devoted to general debate, and on Wednesday the gentleman from New York and I will make short statements relating to the bill, and we hope to pass the bill some time Thursday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman says that general debate will continue through tomorrow, and will he ask to come in at 11 o'clock on Wednesday?

Mr. OLIVER. As I said, tomorrow will be devoted to general debate only.

Mr. BACON. Reserving the right to object, I think there are other matters which will come up tomorrow, and I think the gentleman from Alabama is correct in asking that the House come in at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. MAPES. Reserving the right to object, there are committee meetings scheduled for tomorrow, and some of us have other engagements made far in advance which will make it impossible to be here at 11 o'clock tomorrow. The gentleman from New York states that other business may come before the House. I should like to ask what that business may be?

Mr. OLIVER. I have no information. Perhaps the gentleman from New York can answer the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. There has been a report filed from the Committee on Rules, but the Chair has no information as to whether it will be called up tomorrow or not.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to object, but it would inconvenience several people to have the House meet at 11 o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER. If any business should come up at 11 o'clock, I would ask the Speaker that it lay over until after 12 o'clock, when the Committee could rise so that it might be considered if such was the will of the House.

Mr. MAPES. That is rather a difficult matter to handle. It would seem to me the gentleman could run a little later in the afternoon with less inconvenience to Members than to have the House meet at 11 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. OLIVER. We could have run this afternoon later, but some of the Members who were to speak were not prepared to go on today.

Mr. MAPES. They will be tomorrow.

Mr. OLIVER. Unless the gentleman has some good reason, I hope he will not object to the request.

Mr. MAPES. I have a very good reason personally, and in addition to that I know there are some meetings of committees scheduled for tomorrow that will be interfered with if the House meets at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I do not like to object, but the Committee on Agriculture tomorrow has an important hearing, and but one meeting has been held so far for the purpose to which the meeting is to be devoted. In view of the temporary absence of the chairman to get permission of the committee to sit during the sessions of the House, I do not see how we could conduct the business we have before us in half an hour, inasmuch as the committee is scheduled to meet at 10:30 o'clock in the morning. Inasmuch as nothing more than general debate is to be indulged in tomorrow, I do not see why committee meetings should be inconvenienced just to allow Members to talk on any subject under the sun.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

NATION'S FAITH IN THE GODLY

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a speech I delivered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, by myself, delivered Sunday, July 7, 1934, at the Washington Memorial Chapel of the National Washington Memorial Church, Valley Forge, Pa.:

I feel here today, as a layman, somewhat diffident. To an extent, I have a sense of embarrassment, in the same way, perhaps, that Abraham Lincoln once experienced on a certain occasion after his defeat following the great debates between him and Stephen A. Douglas. He was in the city of Chicago one evening and was invited to make an address. Upon reaching the place where the address was to be made, he found it to be an assemblage of writers, and he said:

"Here I am before a group of writers. I am not a writer, and I am embarrassed almost as much as I was one night in the city of Springfield. I turned a corner rapidly, and as I did so, I ran into a woman. As we backed away after having collided, she looked at me and said, 'Oh, what an ugly man.' I said to her, 'But, lady, I can't help that.' Then she took another look at me and said, 'Well, but you might have stayed at home.'"

I have always felt that when laymen attempt to function within the sacred walls of a church; maybe, after all, it would have been better if they had stayed at home.

However, I am glad to be here for many reasons. I feel honored that the Governor of the great State of Missouri selected me to represent him on this occasion. I know that of the Congressmen who represent our State, any one of the others would have perhaps been a wiser selection.

I remember one night, many years ago—to be exact, in 1908—I was seated in front of a little hotel in Cork, Ireland. Presently there rang out some church-bell chimes that were so beautiful they sounded to me as chimes had never sounded before.

I turned to a bystander and asked, "What chimes are those?" He answered, "Those are the famous bells of Shandon." "Are they the ones described in the poem as the bells of Shandon that sound so grand on the pleasant waters of the River Lee?" I asked, and he replied in the affirmative.

I then turned to the young man with me and said, "Let us go to that church and get nearer those chimes."

It was a hot evening, and he said: "I don't want to go; I am tired; you go." It was but a short distance to the church, but still

he persisted in his refusal to accompany me. Finally I said to him: "You should come with me. If your mother were here, she would go, and she would pray a couple of hours after reaching the church."

That seemed to appeal to him, and he walked up the hill with me to the church.

When we reached its portals, I looked around and looked within it, and something about its appearance caused me to make further inquiry. As a gentleman came by I asked him: "What church is this?" He said: "Why, this is a Church of England, an Episcopal Church."

Knowing that the poem, *The Bells of Shandon*, had been written by a Catholic priest, Father Francis Mahoney, also known as "Father Prout", I had presumed that the bells were in a church of his faith. When I learned that the church was an Episcopal one, and that the poem was inspired by the beauty of the chimes themselves, with no thought of denominationalism, the bells were dearer than ever to me.

My selection to be here today was made by Gov. Guy B. Park of Missouri. He sent me the letter written to him by Mr. C. C. Wilson, Jr., secretary of the vestry of the Washington Memorial Chapel, and asked me to represent Missouri on this day. Again I had a thought, growing out of Mr. Wilson's letter, similar to the thought I had the day I learned the denomination of the church whose bells had inspired the writing of the *Bells of Shandon* by a Catholic priest. In Mr. Wilson's letter to Governor Park he said, "No denominationalism should be considered in making your appointment."

If I had no other reason to want to be here, these would be sufficient: First, that it is the desire of the managing body; second, that I have been selected by the Governor of my State, who is a follower of the teachings of Alexander Campbell, while I am an humble member of the Roman Catholic Church.

FAITH AND PATRIOTISM

To me the linking of religion and patriotism, such as is done in services of this kind, is very beneficial to our civilization and contributes to the perpetuation of the ideals of the Republic.

In the early days of this Republic, in the crucial period when Valley Forge played so important a part, Washington frequently offered prayers for divine guidance.

When Jefferson, who had been a rector in the Episcopal Church, came to establish a university, he caused the motto to be inscribed above its portals: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make ye free."

We have already proved the truth of Madison's statement—that governments do better without kings and nobles than with them; and likewise the wisdom of his words that "the merit will be doubled by the other lesson that religion flourishes with greater purity without than with the aid of government."

I mention these three men—Washington, Jefferson, and Madison—for the reason they were foremost in a period of outstanding patriots.

Later on, in a most tragic period in the life of the Republic, Abraham Lincoln cried out: "I am fighting this fight in the Jeffersonian, Washingtonian, Madisonian way."

Let the story of Valley Forge, with its sufferings, privations, and patriotism, be so imprinted on the minds of all Americans that in future crises of government, should they arise, they may say, in the same spirit that inspired Lincoln: "Yes; again we are fighting in the Jeffersonian, Washingtonian, Madisonian, Valley Forge way."

In representing the great State of Missouri on this Missouri's Day at the Washington Memorial Chapel, I can think of nothing more appropriate than to read the preamble to the constitution of our State:

"We, the people of Missouri, with profound reverence for the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, and grateful for His goodness, do, for the better government of the State, establish this constitution."

Missouri came into the Union on August 10, 1821, as the twenty-fourth State. It completed the first half of the 48 States to be admitted.

In the early days of this Republic there was a profound reverence for religion on the part of those who participated in its formation.

I am sure that this Government will never be destroyed by those who believe in God nor by those who go to church. If it is destroyed, it will be destroyed by those who lack proper reverence for the basic truths of religion. Hence I feel that nothing could be more beneficial than celebrations of this kind, not only to perpetuate the inspiring memories of those who participated in the formation of this Republic but to aid in keeping the Republic in the pathways of the fathers.

THE RELIGION OF WASHINGTON

How beautiful is the thought of George Washington in prayer while leading his forces as Commander in Chief. There is the story of how Isaac Potts came upon Washington in a thicket at Valley Forge one day. Washington was upon his knees in prayer. Isaac ran to his wife and said: "All's well; all's well! George Washington will yet prevail. Thee knows that I always thought that the sword and the gospel were utterly inconsistent and that no man could be a soldier and a Christian at the same time. But George Washington has this day convinced me of my mistake."

He then told his wife what he had seen, and added: "If George Washington be not a man of God, I am greatly deceived, and still more shall I be deceived if God do not, through him, work out a great salvation for America!"

Throughout this historic country and on the highways leading into it I have found many mute evidences of Washington's devotion

to religion. Just outside of Washington City, on the old Fairfax Road, stands the Falls Church, which bears the inscription: "Of this church George Washington was a member and a vestryman." In Christ Church at Alexandria is still to be seen Washington's family pew, a sacred shrine to patriotic visitors.

In driving over route 40, which for a long way through the mountains covers the old Braddock Trail, I came upon a monument on the roadside near the fragment of the old trail that Braddock as general and Washington as colonel passed over in 1753. I got out of my automobile to read the inscription on the monument. It read: "Here lies General Braddock, who was killed in the French and Indian war. The funeral services were read by Col. George Washington."

A GOVERNMENT OF LAWS

The governments in Europe, immediately preceding the American Revolution, were in a chaotic state. The framers of our Constitution had before them the historic records of misgovernment in Europe for centuries. They prepared a document that was to give us a government of laws, not of men.

Today the world's governments are in peril. Consider the ideals of one country where, according to press dispatches, 90 men were executed after a 3-minute hearing. Let us hope that there will never come a day in America when men will be executed for mere differences of political opinion.

European apologists say that the government was within its revolutionary rights when it summarily put to death this great number of men; but they also admit that it would have been wiser to have taken measures in advance that would have obviated the necessity of such action.

The founders of our Government did that very thing; they gave to the United States a constitutional form of government which provided an orderly procedure for the protection of all rights to life, liberty, and property, and for the prosecution of all offenders against these rights. The arch enemy of America is the man who, acting as an agent for the people, takes away, directly or indirectly, any of the constitutional rights of the American citizen.

The Constitution provided a way to amend its provisions. And no one can say, with the record of the enactment and repeal of the eighteenth amendment before us, that the way provided is slow or cumbersome. The eighteenth amendment was enacted and made a part of the Constitution a very short time after the movement to have it adopted was inaugurated; and within 1 year after Congress voted its resubmission to the electorate, the American people themselves responded and took it out of the Constitution.

THE LESSON OF VALLEY FORGE

Hence those who complain that the Constitution is too rigid and inflexible can change it, if they wish, but it should be done in the way the fathers intended—by amendment, submitted to the whole electorate. It was never intended that constitutional rights, guaranteed to the citizen, should be set aside by mere legislative acts or manifestoes of the Chief Executive.

Those of Valley Forge—who marched barefooted through the snow, leaving bloodstains as they walked along; who had to ford the river on a wintry day; who slept at times on frozen ground, unsheltered; amongst whom sickness was a daily ordeal, many dying without proper care—those brave men suffered that this Government, this Republic, should come into existence. The enemy from within did everything to degrade Washington, but Washington never faltered. He faced a common enemy and likewise he faced the Tories from within. Let us hope that we of this day and our posterity shall be moved in our efforts and desire to perpetuate the Republic by the same brand of patriotism that moved our ancestors in its formation and in their efforts to establish for us a constitutional democracy, dedicated to the highest ideals of freedom, justice, and opportunity.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4304. An act to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 5, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

191. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting drafts of certain bills recommended for consideration at the present session of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

192. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and

preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925, to authorize the payment of a per diem in connection with naval aerial surveys and flight checking of aviation charts; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. OLIVER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5255. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 94. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House to investigate all forms of criminal activity in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 140. Joint Resolution to provide for the completion of the publication of the writings of George Washington; with amendment (Rept. No. 57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOBBINS: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 5218. A bill to postpone the effective date of certain restrictions respecting air mail contracts; without amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3721. A bill for the relief of Angelo J. Gillotti; without amendment (Rept. No. 58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARTER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2192. A bill for the relief of Harry B. Walmsley; without amendment (Rept. No. 60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5032. A bill to correct and complete the military record of Carl Lindow, known also as Carl Lindo; without amendment (Rept. No. 62). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5133. A bill for the relief of Nellie Oliver; without amendment (Rept. No. 61). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3102) granting a pension to Emma M. Pearson, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OLIVER: A bill (H. R. 5255) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 5256) to provide for the construction of four vessels for the Coast Guard designed for ice-breaking and assistance work; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DREWRY: A bill (H. R. 5257) to amend section 7 of the act approved May 29, 1934 (48 Stat. 811); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 5258) authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for

financing buildings that were in the course of construction at the inception of the present emergency, where the owners have been unable to obtain funds through the usual channels or from the general public; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL: A bill (H. R. 5259) to provide for the construction of a post office at Newport, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5260) to provide for the construction of a post office at Colville, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 5261) authorizing the appropriation of \$1,000 for the erection of a tablet or marker at or near Meade, Kans., to commemorate the Lone Tree Massacre; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 5262) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by providing for the regulation of the transportation of passengers and property by motor carriers operating in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 5263) to purchase and erect in the city of Washington the group of statuary known as the "Indian Buffalo Hunt"; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KENNEY: A bill (H. R. 5264) to aid the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia in meeting emergency educational problems; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5265) to extend the time for naturalization of alien veterans of the World War, and to authorize naturalization of certain veterans of countries allied with the United States during the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KNIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 5266) to amend the act approved February 15, 1929, entitled "An act to permit certain warrant officers to count all active service rendered under temporary appointments as warrant or commissioned officers in the Regular Navy, or as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Naval Reserve Force, for the purpose of promotion to chief warrant rank"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5267) to authorize the transfer of officers of the Construction Corps of the Navy to the line of the Navy for aeronautical engineering duty only, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 5268) to amend section 617 of the Revenue Act of 1932, approved June 6, 1932, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUCKEY: A bill (H. R. 5269) placing the Post Office Department upon a basis of efficiency and economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 5270) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy, and officers and enlisted men of the Marine Corps, to accept such medals, orders, diplomas, decorations, and photographs as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: A bill (H. R. 5271) to preserve from extinction the American eagle, emblem of the sovereignty of the United States of America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 5272) to authorize the conveyance by the United States to the State of Wisconsin of a portion of the Eagle Bluff Lighthouse Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEFAN: A bill (H. R. 5273) placing the Post Office Department upon a basis of efficiency and economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SWEENEY: A bill (H. R. 5274) extending the classified civil service to include special-delivery messengers; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 5275) to protect labor in its old age; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. QUINN: A bill (H. R. 5276) to limit the amounts that may be loaned by national banking associations upon shares of stock of corporations used as collateral security for such loans; to prohibit loans upon shares of "watered" stock of public-service or other corporations; to prevent abnormal stock-market booms and the stock-market panics, bank failures, and industrial depressions that inevitably follow; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5277) to define and regulate the value of the dollar, to establish a 2-commodity or bimetallic unit of value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 5278) to establish the Bureau of Veterans' Affairs in the Department of the Treasury, with the Commissioner of Veterans' Affairs at the head thereof; to abolish the Veterans' Administration and transfer its functions pertaining to veterans' affairs to such Bureau; to adjust and equalize pensions of veterans and widows and dependents of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5279) to adjust and equalize benefits for veterans and widows and dependents of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 5280) to provide for the inclusion of Warner Hall, Gloucester County, Va., in the Colonial National Monument, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: A bill (H. R. 5281) to provide for the protection of dogs trained in the service of the blind; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 5282) to extend the provisions of the Forest Exchange Act to lands adjacent to the Mount Baker National Forest, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 5283) to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the making of property returns by officers of the Government", approved March 29, 1894, as amended (U. S. C., title 31, secs. 89 to 92) (giving to facts stated in certificates charging officers with loss of Government property the same status as if they had been ascertained by the General Accounting Office); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 5284) to require bidders for carrying mail on star routes to be residents within the delivery zone of such routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 5285) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide relief to Government contractors whose costs of performance were increased as a result of compliance with the act approved June 16, 1933, and for other purposes", approved June 16, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 5286) to prohibit the acceptance of Postal Savings deposits in communities where adequate banking facilities are available; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mrs. NORTON (by request): A bill (H. R. 5287) to amend the act of March 4, 1933, relating to the regulation of banking in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BINDERUP: A bill (H. R. 5288) placing the Post Office Department upon a basis of efficiency and economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GEARHART: A bill (H. R. 5289) to authorize the erection of a Veterans' Administration hospital in the State of California; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mrs. GREENWAY: A bill (H. R. 5290) for the relief of certain claimants in cases of contracts connected with prosecution of the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON: A bill (H. R. 5291) to authorize payment to the Sac and Fox (of Missouri) Tribe of Indians of certain tribal funds to their credit in the United States Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 5292) to provide for the measurement of vessels using the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 5293) to prevent profiteering in time of war and to equalize the burdens of war and thus to promote the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5294) requiring the War Department to follow a uniform procedure in selecting trainees from the Officers' Reserve Corps for active-duty assignments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5295) requiring the War Department to make the award of the Purple Heart Medal decoration to any soldier upon presentation of proof of wounds if such proof is such as is acceptable to the Veterans' Administration when a claim is filed for compensation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5296) to provide Federal aid for public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. WOLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 5297) to amend section 22 (g) of the Federal Reserve Act relating to loans to executive officers of member banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McGRATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 151) authorizing and requesting the President to invite the countries of the world to participate in the San Francisco Exposition of 1938, at San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CITRON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 152) for the preservation and restoration of the frigate *Hartford* as a national museum and making Hartford, Conn., its home port; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the romantic settlement of various Indian tribes in Oklahoma and honoring the famous Indian Chief Sequoyah, inventor of the Cherokee alphabet; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McGRATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 154) to define foreign policies of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 155) relating to the continuance on the pay rolls of certain employees in cases of death of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding the manufacture of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5298) granting a pension to Nettie B. Shores; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARPENTER: A bill (H. R. 5299) granting a pension to Faye E. Gulley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUNCAN: A bill (H. R. 5300) for the relief of Joy Sturgis; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EKWALL: A bill (H. R. 5301) granting a pension to Myrtle J. Buzan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 5302) granting a pension to Roy E. Proskey; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5303) for the relief of Charles W. Eaton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 5304) for the relief of George E. Titter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5305) for the relief of Cecil Lodge, No. 125, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5306) to provide for a survey of the waters of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries with reference to depletion of the supply of certain fish; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5307) for the relief of Mallery Toy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A bill (H. R. 5308) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hammer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H. R. 5309) for the relief of Robert Green; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5310) granting a pension to David Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 5311) for the relief of John Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINZER: A bill (H. R. 5312) granting a pension to Joseph B. Geiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLOEB: A bill (H. R. 5313) granting a pension to Effie P. Chiles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5314) granting a pension to Anna E. Routson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5315) granting a pension to Hazel Corene Covault; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5316) granting an increase of pension to Cecelia A. Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5317) for the relief of Paul Winters York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5318) to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to James A. Sherbundy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 5319) for the relief of Hilbert R. Hall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 5320) granting a pension to Fred E. Ricketts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 5321) for the relief of Charles E. Names; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 5322) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 5323) to tax the Donner-Hanna Coke Corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 5324) granting an increase of pension to Mamie F. Presley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5325) for the relief of Ira L. Reeves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5326) granting a pension to Hattie Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5327) granting a pension to Ethel Kapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5328) granting a pension to Belle Hockensmith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5329) granting a pension to Willie A. McDonald; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 5330) granting a pension to Jennie Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5331) granting a pension to Mary E. Brummett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5332) granting a pension to Ollie G. Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5333) granting a pension to Rebecca A. Wilder; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5334) for the relief of Robert Chadwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5335) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Woods; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 5336) for the relief of George D. Johnson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5337) for the relief of Wilson G. Bingham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT: A bill (H. R. 5338) granting a pension to Stillman Garrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5339) granting a pension to Nancy Ellen Satterlee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 5340) for the relief of Carmine Sforza; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5341) granting Stanley Harrison the privilege of filing application for benefits under the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 5342) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Love; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 5343) for the relief of W. L. Horn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWEENEY: A bill (H. R. 5344) for the relief of Daniel E. Craig; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5345) granting an increase of pension to L. Z. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5346) granting an increase of pension to Daniel E. Craig; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 5347) for the relief of Bertha Moseley Bottoms; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5348) for the relief of William W. Perryman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5349) for the relief of M. E. Parmalee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 5350) granting a pension to Katherine Mueller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5351) for the relief of Rose Teiermeyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 5352) for the relief of Ferry Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 5353) for the relief of Northrop Banks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5354) granting a pension to Irma Mendenhall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5355) granting a pension to Missouri Pettis Benton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

721. By Mr. BELL: Petition of citizens of Jackson County, advocating the adoption of House Resolution 2856, introduced by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

722. Also, resolution of the Aubuchon-Dennison Post, No. 186, of the American Legion; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

723. By Mr. BOYLAN: Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 34, adopted by the Assembly and Senate of the State of New York, referring to the enactment by Congress of a law compelling manufacturers of firearms to mark such firearms with a serial number, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

724. By Mr. BRUNNER: Resolution of United Polish Societies of Jamaica, Jamaica, N. Y., in the interest of the 8,000 home owners who have applied for loans, urging Congress to enact such legislation as will take care of as many of those distressed cases who are in urgent need of mortgage relief as are worthy of consideration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

725. Also, resolution of the Rego Park Democratic Club, Elmhurst, Long Island, N. Y., urging Congress to allot an additional sum of money to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to carry on its activities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

726. Also, resolution of the Central Queens Allied Civic Council, Inc., Jamaica, Long Island, N. Y., urging Congress to make an additional appropriation to continue the activities of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

727. Also, resolution of the Jackson Heights Community Council, Jackson Heights, N. Y., through its secretary, Miss Rose L. Robilotta, asking that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation continue to make loans, and that the Federal Housing Act of 1934 be amended so that the interest charged mortgagees be 4 percent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

728. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of Harriet Faxon and other residents of DeKalb County, Ill., requesting the passage of House bill 2856, which would provide for a Federal old-age pension system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

729. Also, petition of John Good and other citizens of Morris, Ill., requesting the passage of the bill introduced by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma (H. R. 2856) to provide for a Federal old-age-pension system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

730. Also, petition of Lee Portee and other residents, of De Kalb County, Ill., requesting the passage of the bill introduced by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma (H. R. 2856) to provide for a Federal old-age-pension system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

731. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of Fred McGregor, Martin Mossefin, James Heng, and 153 other citizens, of Crookston, Minn., praying for passage of the Townsend old-age-pension bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

732. Also, petition of Ole Gullickson, vice chairman, and other members of the Beltrami County (Minn.) Farmer-Labor Association, all residents of Beltrami County of Minnesota, praying for legislation to pay the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

733. By Mr. COLDEN: Communication from William Messenger, Los Angeles, Calif., regarding unemployment and the general business depression throughout the country, and suggesting measures for the relief of such conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

734. By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petitions of numerous citizens of Lake Odessa, Corunna, and Saginaw, Mich., urging the enactment of the McGroarty old-age-pension bill (H. R. 3977); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

735. By Mr. DEMPSEY: Petition of the Legislature of New Mexico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

736. By Mr. DEROUEN: Petition of citizens of Allen Parish, La., endorsing the old-age-pension bill (H. R. 2856) by Representative WILL ROGERS; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

737. By Mr. FULMER: Concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, the Senate concurring, urging the United States Senators and the Members in the National House of Representatives from South Carolina, to assist in lowering the present high Federal tax on liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

738. By Mr. HOEPEL: Resolution of the Council of the City of Los Angeles, urging support of the joint resolution, providing for Nation-wide telephone investigation by the Communications Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

739. By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: Petition presented by 15 citizens of Jackson County, Ohio, urging and demanding that the old-age-pension bill, sponsored by Dr. J. E. Pore and Representative ROGERS, of Oklahoma, be enacted into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

740. By Mr. KENNEY: Petition of Senate and House of the State of New Jersey, urging Congress refrain from en-

tertaining legislation which has for its purpose the removal from the Newark Metropolitan Airport of the metropolitan air-mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

741. Also, petition of New Jersey State League of Municipalities, endorsing the bill (H. R. 2803) to provide for additional funds for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

742. Also, petition of the New Jersey Farm Bureau of Trenton, N. J., resolving that the Agricultural Adjustment Act be amended so as to prohibit any farmer from receiving benefit payment for crop reduction unless the acreage taken out of production is not used to grow cash crops or is devoted only to soil-improvement crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

743. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Pauline H. Knight and other citizens, of Columbus, Ohio, urging that the Nye munitions' investigation be continued; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

744. Also, petition of Mrs. Myron S. Siebert and other citizens, of Columbus, Ohio, urging for the continuance of the Nye munitions' investigation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

745. By Mr. LANHAM: Petition of a number of citizens of Johnson County, Tex., favoring the old-age-pension bill (H. R. 2856); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

746. By Mr. LUCKEY: Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish an arboretum at Nebraska City, Nebr.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

747. By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of residents of Desha County, Ark., regarding House bill 2856, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

748. Also, petition of residents of Drew County, Ark., regarding House bill 2856 by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

749. Also, petition of residents of Arkansas County, Ark., regarding House bill 2856, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

750. Also, petition of residents of Lincoln County, Ark., regarding House bill 2856, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

751. Also, petition of residents of Cleveland County, Ark., regarding House bill 2856, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

752. Also, petition of residents of Dallas County, Ark., regarding House bill 2856, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

753. Also, petition of residents of Jefferson County, Ark., regarding House bill 2856, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

754. Also, petition of residents of Lonoke County, Ark., regarding House bill 2856, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

755. Also, petition of residents of Grant County, Ark., regarding House bill 2856, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

756. Also, petition of residents of Hot Springs County, Ark., regarding House bill 2856, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

757. Also, petition of residents of Saline County, Ark., regarding House bill 2856, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

758. Also, petition of residents of Garland County, Ark., regarding House bill 2856, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

759. By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Petitions of residents of Colorado in behalf of House bill 2858, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma, providing a national system of old-age pensions (the Pope plan); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

760. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Senate of the State of New York, requesting the Federal Government to enact laws to control the uncontrolled market of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

761. Also, Petition of the Erie County Board of Supervisors, New York State, complimenting Buffalo's Representatives in Congress for their continued support of the Niagara River sewage-disposal project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

762. Also, petition of the City Council of Lockport, N. Y., requesting that the Erie Barge Canal, both western and eastern sections, be improved; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

763. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Williston Bates and other residents of Randolph County, Ark., asking for the enactment of an adequate old-age pension law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

764. Also, petition of Cleve Davis and others, of Lawrence County, Ark., asking for the enactment of an adequate old-age-pension law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

765. Also, petition of Mary Foreman and others, of Izard County, Ark., asking for the enactment of an adequate old-age-pension law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

766. Also, petition of David M. Rosier and others, of Fulton County, Ark., asking for the enactment of an adequate old-age-pension law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

767. Also, petition of M. W. Sargent and 1,734 other citizens, of Sharp County, Ark., asking that an adequate old-age-pension law be enacted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

768. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of W. M. O'Brien and some 20 other individuals, of Waterbury, Vt., registering their opposition to the passage by Congress of the Black-Connery bill or any other bill designed to reduce to 30 hours the working hours per week in industry; to the Committee on Labor.

769. By Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: Joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, asking Congress to amend the Internal Revenue Act so that the net income, if any there be, derived from the operation of a State system of liquor control should be clearly exempt from taxation by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

770. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of State Council of Pennsylvania, Junior Order United American Mechanics, asking for legislation making it mandatory upon all aliens in the United States to immediately declare their intention of citizenship; that all aliens be required to register at once in their respective counties to proper authority; that any alien failing to register, when required by law, or failing to declare such intention of citizenship 90 days therefrom be subject to deportation as undesirables by the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

771. Also, petition of State Council of Pennsylvania, Junior Order United American Mechanics, opposing the United States being made a haven for diseased, criminal, communistic, anarchistic, or illegally entered aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

772. Also, petition of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Missouri, through its chief clerk, favoring the passage of such legislation as is necessary for the immediate payment of the balance due on World War adjusted-service certificates, with remittance of interest and other charges against the principal sum of such certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

773. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petitions of citizens of Wood, Rusk, Panola, Smith, Upshur, and Gregg Counties, Tex., urging passage of old-age-pension legislation as embodied in House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

774. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of residents of northern New York, relating to legislation for the Townsend plan of old-age revolving pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

775. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact with all convenient speed the Costigan antilynching

bill or other like legislation which will prevent the punishment or destruction of persons accused or suspected of crime in any other way or by any other authority than by due process of law and by a duly constituted court of justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

776. Also, petition of the Legislature of New York State, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact with all convenient speed such legislation as may be necessary to abolish the Federal gasoline sales tax and to surrender to the States exclusively the power to tax such sales in the future; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

777. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of H. C. Stickel and 30 residents of Dawson, Fayette County, Pa., and vicinity, favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

778. By Mr. TABER: Petitions of A. Peters and 19 other citizens of Catoosa County, Ga., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

779. Also, petitions of J. A. Massey and 15 other citizens of Dade County; Omer Peter Roberson and 14 other citizens of Floyd County; Sarah Pace and 19 other citizens of Floyd County; Margaret Jenkins and 14 other citizens of Dade County; Kiggie Nelson and 6 other citizens of Bartow County; Ella Cash and 15 other citizens of Haralson County, Ga., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

780. Also, petitions of Mary M. Edwards and 17 other citizens of Chattooga County; Emma Smith and 6 other citizens of Floyd County; Walter L. Rogers and 16 other citizens of Murray County; Mrs. Malley Rich and 9 other citizens of Murray County; J. F. McDonald and 14 other citizens of Haralson County; D. W. Long and 2 other citizens of Gordon County; Mrs. J. A. Beaver and 10 other citizens of Walker County, Ga., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

781. By Mr. TURNER: Petitions (56) from National Old Age Pension Association and the Non-Partisan Voters' Secret League, regarding House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

782. By Mr. WALLGREN: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, approving immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

783. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of mayor and city council of the city of Brockton, Mass., urging the immediate reopening of the shoe code in justice to shoe workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord God, Thou who art the abiding reality of the universe, we wait at Thy mercy seat in prayer. Everything that is best is here: the supreme pattern of character and where is inspired the essential principle of a good life. Send us forth with the ideal that we shall help the world while in the world we stay. May we never allow our conscience to be dulled or our affections chilled toward our fellow men where the lamp of happiness glows dim and gray. Do Thou enable us to hold to the realities of power, greatness, and everlasting joy by avoiding the false and flattering things of life. O Father of Light, O Spirit Divine, touch our souls that we may breathe the ampler air of meditation and devotion; delight the inner eye with constant vision of the pure and beautiful; lead us to drink afresh of the eternal fountain and rejoice in the glory of a golden sun and a purple sky. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CLERK'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1935.

The SPEAKER THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: There is on file in this office a certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK as a Representative to the Seventy-fourth Congress from the Second Congressional District of the State of Indiana to fill the vacancy in that district.

Yours very truly,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from the Second Congressional District of the State of Indiana, Mr. CHARLES A. HALLECK, is present and desires to take the oath of office.

Mr. HALLECK appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS ARE NOT YET A REALITY

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous and well-nigh unanimous sentiment today in every section of the country for genuine old-age pensions. Therefore I want to examine how much that sentiment has been able to crystallize itself into laws.

What old-age pension laws do we have today? What are their provisions? Do they provide old-age pensions? Are they genuine? Or do they exist in name only?

With this information before us we can then establish what old-age-pension laws we should have and what the prospects for obtaining them are.

STATE OLD-AGE PENSIONS AS THEY EXIST TODAY DO NOT PROVIDE REAL SECURITY FOR THE AGED

There are 28 States in the Union and 2 Territories, Alaska and Hawaii, which have old-age-pension laws. In 8 of these 28 States the laws exist only on the statute books. No old-age pensions whatever are being paid. In 10 other States very little is paid out on old-age pensions, so that in 18 States out of the 28 old-age-pension laws exist only on paper and not in reality.

Even in the other States the old-age-pension laws are inadequate. In these 10 States, 6 provide for an age limit of 70 years and 4 for an age limit of 65 years. And note this: There is not a single State or Territory in the Union which provides for old-age pensions at 60 years.

The best old-age-pension laws in the Nation are those of the States of New York and Massachusetts. These States do not establish a specific maximum pension, thus permitting persons to receive as much as is needed for a decent and healthy life. For instance, in the city of New York the pension is higher than elsewhere in the State, because the cost of living is higher in larger cities. The average pension for the State of New York as a whole for 1933 was \$22.16; for New York City the average probably amounts to around \$40.

EVEN THE BEST OF THE STATE OLD-AGE-PENSION LAWS HAVE SERIOUS DEFECTS

But even the old-age-pension laws of New York State and of Massachusetts have serious defects. They do not give a pension until a person is 70 years of age and provide that the pensioner must have resided in the State for at least 10 years.

According to the census figures of 1930 New York State had 373,878 persons 70 years of age and over, and therefore eligible. Of these only 51,228, or 13.7 percent, were receiving pensions in 1933. The total amount of old-age pensions paid out by the State of New York in 1933 amounted to \$13,592,080.

Let me give some more figures: Of the 28 States I have mentioned, 14 States provide a minimum age limit of 70 years, 13 a minimum age limit of 65 years, and 1 a minimum age limit of 68 years; 15 States provide for a maximum pay-